

THE
NATIONAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

EDWARD I. SEARS, LL.D.

Pulchrum est bene facere reipublicæ, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est.

VOL. XX. No. XXXIX. DECEMBER, 1869.

NEW YORK :
EDWARD I. SEARS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
61 BROADWAY.

GENERAL AGENTS:

NEW YORK: AMERICAN NEWS CO., 121 NASSAU STREET. BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.,
100 WASHINGTON STREET. PHILADELPHIA: JAMES K. SIMON, SOUTH
SIXTH STREET. LONDON: TRUBNER & CO., 60 PATERNOSTER
ROW. PARIS: VICTOR ALEXI, 19 RUE DU MAIL.

1869.

STEINWAY & SONS

TRIUMPHANT

AT THE

UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION,

PARIS, 1867.



STEINWAY & SONS

HAVE BEEN AWARDED THE

FIRST GRAND GOLD MEDAL

For American Pianos in all three styles Exhibited, viz. Grand, Square and Upright; this Medal being DISTINCTLY CLASSIFIED FIRST IN ORDER OF MERIT, and placed at the head of the List of all Exhibitors, in proof of which the following

OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE

of the President and Members of the International Jury of Musical Instruments (Class X,) is subjoined:

"I certify that the First Gold Medal for American Pianos has been unanimously awarded Messrs. STEINWAY by the Jury of the International Exposition. First on the List is Class X."

"MILINET, President of International Jury.

GEORGES KASTNER,
AMBROISE THOMAS,
ED. HANSLICK,
F. E. GEVAERT,
J. SCHIEDMEYER,

Members of the
International Jury."

This unanimous decision of the International Class Jury, endorsed by the Supreme Group Jury, and affirmed by the Imperial Commission, being the final verdict of the only tribunal determining the rank of awards at the exposition, places *The Steinway Pianos* at the head of all others, in competition with over FOUR HUNDRED PIANOS entered by the most celebrated European and American manufacturers.

LATIN AND GREEK TEXT-BOOKS

Published by HARPER & BROTHERS, New York.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. Vol. 1, containing the Four Gospels. 8vo, Cloth, \$6 00; Sheep, \$6 50.

ANDREW'S LATIN-ENGLISH LEXICON, founded on the larger German-Latin Lexicon of Dr. Wm. Freund. Royal 8vo, Sheep, \$7 50.

DR. ANTHON'S CLASSICAL SERIES.

ANTHON'S LATIN LESSONS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.

ANTHON'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.
A Key to Latin Composition, may be obtained by Teachers. 12mo, Half Sheep, 75 cents.

ANTHON'S ZUMPT'S LATIN GRAMMAR. By Leonard Schmitz, Ph. D. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S ZUMPT'S LATIN GRAMMAR. Abridged. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 00.

ANTHON'S LATIN VERSIFICATION. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.
A Key to Latin Versification may be obtained by Teachers. 12mo, Half Sheep, 75 cents.

ANTHON'S LATIN PROSODY AND METRE. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.

ANTHON'S CÆSAR. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 75.

ANTHON'S ECLOGUES AND GEORGICS OF VIRGIL. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 75.

ANTHON'S SALLUST. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S HORACE. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 75.

ANTHON'S CICERO'S SELECT ORATIONS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S CICERO'S TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S CICERO DE SENECA, &c. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S CICERO DE OFFICIIS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S TACITUS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S CORNELIUS NEPOS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S JUVENAL. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S FIRST GREEK LESSONS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.

ANTHON'S GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.

ANTHON'S NEW GREEK GRAMMAR. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S GREEK PROSODY AND METRE. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 25.

ANTHON'S JACOBS' GREEK READER. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S XENOPHON'S ANABASIS. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S XENOPHON'S MEMORABILA OF SOCRATES. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S HOMER. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 75.

ANTHON'S MANUAL OF GREEK ANTIQUITIES. 12mo, Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S MANUAL OF ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S MANUAL OF GREEK LITERATURE. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S SMITH'S DICTIONARY of Greek and Roman Antiquities, from the best Authorities and embodying all the recent Discoveries of the most eminent German Philologists and Jurists. Royal 8vo, Sheep, \$6 00.

ANTHON'S SMITH'S ANTIQUITIES. Abridged by the Authors. 12mo, Half Sheep, \$1 50.

ANTHON'S CLASSICAL DICTIONARY of the Geography, History, Biography, Mythology, and fine arts of the Greeks and Romans, together with an Account of the Coins, Weights, and Measures of the Ancients, with tabular Values of the same. Royal 8vo, Sheep, \$6 00.

ANTHON'S SMITH'S NEW CLASSICAL DICTIONARY of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology, and Geography. Numerous Corrections and Additions. Royal 8vo, Sheep, \$5 00.

ANTHON'S LATIN-ENGLISH AND ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY. For the use of Schools, Small 4to, Sheep, \$3 50.

ANTHON'S RIDDLE AND ARNOLD'S ENGLISH-LATIN LEXICON. With a copious Dictionary of Proper Names, from the best Sources. Royal 8vo, Sheep, \$5 00.

BUTTMAN'S GREEK GRAMMAR. For High Schools and Universities. Translated by Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D. 8vo, Sheep, \$2 50.

COLLORD'S LATIN ACCIDENCE and Primary Lesson Book. 12mo, \$1 50.

ENGLISHMAN'S GREEK CONCORDANCE of the New Testament, 8vo, Cloth, \$5 00.

HARPER'S GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS. Carefully reprinted from the best Editions.

[OVER.]

Elegantly printed. 18mo, Flexible Cloth Binding, 75 cents a volume :
 Caesar, Lucertius,
 Sallust, Xenophon's Anabasis,
 Virgilius, Eschylus,
 Cicero de Senectute Euripides (3 vols.)
 and De Amicitia, Herodotus (2 vols.)
 Horatius, Thucydides (2 vols.)

HARRISON'S LATIN GRAMMAR. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON. From the work of Francis Passow, With Corrections and Additions, and the Insertion, in Alphabetical Order, of the Proper Names occurring in the principal Greek Authors. By HENRY DRISLER, LL.D., Columbia College, N. Y. Royal 8vo, Sheep extra, \$7 50.

M'CLINTOCK'S FIRST BOOK IN LATIN. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

M'CLINTOCK'S SECOND BOOK IN LATIN. Forming a Sufficient Latin Reader. With Imitation Exercises and a Vocabulary. 12mo, Sheep, extra, \$1 50.

M'CLINTOCK'S FIRST BOOK IN GREEK. 12mo, Sheep extra, \$1 50.

M'CLINTOCK'S SECOND BOOK IN GREEK. Forming a Sufficient Greek Reader. With

Notes and a copious Vocabulary. 12mo Sheep extra, \$1 50.

PROFFITT'S PLAUTUS'S CAITIVES. With English Notes. By REV. JOHN PROFFITT, D.D. 12mo, Cloth 75 cents.

ROBINSON'S GREEK LEXICON of the New Testament. A new Edition, revised and in great part re-written. Royal 8vo, Cloth, \$6 00 ; Sheep extra, \$6 50.

SMITH'S (DR. WM.) PRINCIPIA LATINA. Part I. A First Latin Course, Comprehending Grammar, Delectus, and Exercise Book, with Vocabulary. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Revised and Improved by HENRY DRISLER, LL.D. 12mo, Flexible Cloth, 75 cents.

SMITH'S (DR. WM.) PRINCIPIA LATINA. Part II. A First Latin Reading Book, containing an Epitome of Caesar's Gallic Wars, and L'Honond's Lives of Distinguished Romans ; with an Introduction to Roman Antiquities, Notes, and a Dictionary. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Revised and Improved by HENRY DRISLER, LL.D. 12mo, Flexible Cloth, \$1 25.

WADDELL'S GREEK GRAMMAR FOR BEGINNERS. By WILLIAM HENRY WADDELL, Professor of Ancient Languages in the University of Georgia. 12mo, Cloth, \$1 00.

For a full Descriptive List of Books suitable for Schools and Colleges, see HARPER'S CATALOGUES, which may be obtained gratuitously on application to the Publishers personally, or by letter enclosing Five Cents.

THIRTY-FIFTH DIVIDEND.

Safest and Cheapest System of Insurance.

STATEMENT OF THE

WASHINGTON INSURANCE CO.,

172 Broadway, Corner of Maiden Lane,

NEW-YORK, FEB. 6th, 1869.

Cash Capital, - - - \$400,000.

ASSETS, FEB. 1st, 1869.

U. S., State, City and other Stocks, (market value),	\$485,559 00
Bonds and Mortgages.....	89,445 50
Demand Loans.....	95,956 00
Cash.....	49,111 54
Unpaid Premiums.....	8,069 37
Miscellaneous.....	38,988 42

\$767,129 83

Liabilities..... 16,129 83

Capital and Surplus.....\$751,000 00

A DIVIDEND OF (7) SEVEN PER CENT. is this day declared, payable on demand, in Cash, to Stockholders.

ALSO, AN INTEREST DIVIDEND OF (6) SIX PER CENT. on outstanding Scrip, payable 1st of April, in Cash.

ALSO, A SCRIP DIVIDEND OF (45) FORTY-FIVE PER CENT. on the earned premiums of Policies entitled to participate in the profits for the year ending 31st January, 1869.

The Scrip will be ready for delivery on and after the 1st of April next.

Fifty per cent. of the Scrip of 1863 will be redeemed on the 1st of April next, from which date interest thereon will cease.

GEO. C. SATTERLEE, President.
 WM. K. LOTHROP, Secretary.

HENRY WESTON, Vice-President.
 WM. A. SCOTT, Assistant Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE,

NEW-YORK CITY.

FREDERICK A. P. BARNARD, S. T. D., LL.D., President.

The regular scholastic exercises of this institution for the academic year 1869-70, being the one hundred and sixteenth since its foundation, will commence in the several departments, as follows:

I. School of the Liberal Arts, Oct. 4th, 1869.

Applications for admission may be made on Friday, Oct. 1st, or on Friday, June 25th, being the Friday preceding commencement, at the college, East Forty-ninth street, between Madison and Fourth Avenues. Tuition, one hundred dollars per annum, payable in advance. There are no other annual dues.

II. School of Mines, Oct. 4th, 1869.

Examination for admission takes place on Thursday, September 30th. Candidates must be at least eighteen years of age, and must pass a satisfactory examination in algebra, geometry, and plane, analytical and spherical trigonometry. There is a preparatory year for those not qualified for the regular courses.

Fee for the whole course, \$200 per annum, payable semi-annually in advance; which is in full for tuition, use of laboratories, apparatus, chemicals, drawing-room, and students' collection of minerals. Special students in chemistry and assaying are charged the same fee. Special students in assaying are admitted for two months, for a fee of \$50. For single courses of lectures, \$10 to \$30. For further information in regard to this school, application may be made to DR. CHARLES F. CHANDLER, Dean of the Faculty, at the school, Fiftieth street, corner of Fourth Avenue.

III. School of Law, Oct. 6th, 1869.

Students desiring to enter this school will present themselves on that day at the school, 37 Lafayette Place. Examinations for the degree of LL.B. take place Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, May 5th, 6th, and 7th. By statutes of the legislature, graduates of the Law School are admitted to practice in all the courts of the state.

Terms, \$100 per annum, payable in advance. For further information apply to THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL.D., Warden of the school, at the Law School, 37 Lafayette Place.

IV. School of Medicine, Oct. 4th, 1869.

Medical College Building, corner of Twenty-third street and Fourth Avenue. The course of instruction consists of lectures, to the number of five or six daily, in the various departments of medicine and surgery, both elementary and practical, together with daily clinical lectures delivered both at the college and at the larger hospitals.

FEES: Matriculation, \$5; full courses by all the professors, \$140; for each separate ticket, \$20; to the demonstrator of anatomy, \$10; graduation fee, \$30.

For further information address the "Secretary of the faculty of the Columbia College School of Medicine," at the college in Twenty-third Street.

In all the departments, deserving students who find themselves unable to pay the fees, may be admitted to attend gratuitously, by presenting the facts of their several cases to the president, for the School of Arts and the School of Mines; to Professor Dwight, for the School of Law; and to the professors severally for the School of Medicine.

For information in regard to the college generally, the president should be addressed, at the college, East Forty-ninth street, between Fourth and Madison Avenues.

LAW SCHOOL

OF THE

University of Albany.

This School has now THREE TERMS A YEAR. The FIRST commences on the FIRST TUESDAY of September, the SECOND on the LAST TUESDAY of November, and the THIRD on the FIRST TUESDAY of March, each term continuing twelve weeks.

Three successive terms constitute the entire course, and entitle the student to become a candidate for the degree of Bachelor of Laws. Each term is independent and complete as to the instruction embraced in it. The method of teaching is by lecture, examination, and practice in the Moot-Courts. Two lectures are given each day, except Saturdays, and two Moot-Courts held each week, at which causes are first argued by the previously appointed disputants, then discussed and decided by the class, followed by the views of the presiding Professor. The law is taught both as a Science and an Art.

The immense *Law Library of the State* is open to the students, under proper regulations, and all the Terms of the *Supreme Court* and the *Court of Appeals*, the highest Courts of this State, are held in the City of Albany.

The Fee for a single term is \$40; for two terms, \$70; and for three, \$100; each payable in advance. The Professors, and leading topics upon which they lecture, are the following:

HON. IRA HARRIS, LL. D., Practice, Pleadings, Evidence.

HON. AMASA J. PARKER, LL. D., Real Estate, Criminal Law, Personal Rights.

HON. REUBEN H. WALWORTH, LL. D.,

President.

ORLANDO MEADS, LL. D.,

Secretary.

MANHATTAN COLLEGE,

(CHRISTIAN BROTHERS.)

NEW YORK CITY.

This Institution, incorporated and empowered to confer Degrees by the Regents of the University of the State of New York, offers many advantages to further the moral, intellectual, and physical development of students. The situation of the College is not surpassed in landscape beauty, or salubrity, by that of any similar institution in the country. It occupies an elevated position on the east bank of the Hudson, about eight miles from the City Hall.

TERMS.

Board, Washing, and Tuition, per Session of ten months,.....	\$300
Entrance Fee,.....	10
Graduation Fee,.....	10
Vacation at College,.....	40

German, Spanish, Drawing, Music, and use of apparatus in the study of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy, charged extra. School books at current prices.

No student received for a shorter period than one term of five months. No deductions made when withdrawn during the term. The pocket-money of the student is deposited with the treasurer.

Payment of half session of five months in advance.

The sessions commence on the first Monday in September, and end about the 3d of July.

A public examination of the students is held at the end of the session, and gentlemen are invited to examine them then, and also during the class hours of term time.

FOR PARTICULARS SEE CATALOGUE.

PHYSICIAN'S FEE, - - - - - \$10.

SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE AND ANNUITY COMPANY,

Nos. 31 and 33 Pine Street, New York.

OFFICERS.

ROBERT L. CASE, Pres. THEO. R. WETMORE, Vice-Pres.
ISAAC H. ALLEN, Secretary.

DIRECTORS.

EDWARD HAIGHT,	ROBERT BOWNE,
EDWARD WOOD,	CHARLES T. GOODWIN,
CHARLES R. SWORDS,	SIDNEY WINTRINGHAM,
JOHN F. UNDERHILL,	EDWARD MARSHALL,
ROBERT LINDLEY MURRAY,	ROBERT L. CASE,
FRANCIS T. WALKER,	THEODORE R. WETMORE,
WILLIAM HUBBARD,	ISAAC H. ALLEN,
JOHN H. DRAPER,	J. NELSON TAPPAN,
JOSEPH F. KNAPP,	EDMUND TITUS,
JAMES M. DRAKE,	CHARLES BELLOWES,
JAMES BRETT,	REUBEN H. UNDERHILL,
FRANCIS PAYSON,	JOHN T. WILLETS,
AUGUSTUS TABER,	A. R. WETMORE,
JOHN W. GRAYDON,	ROBERT B. HOWLAND,
ISAAC W. RUSHMORE, Brooklyn, L. I.	SANFORD R. KNAPP, Peekskill, N. Y.
NATH. B. WEED, Darien, Ct.	JAMES BIGLER, Newburgh, N. Y.
W. H. WILLIS, New Hamburg, N. Y.	DAVID MOORE,
GEORGE INNIS, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	EDWARD C. JONES, New Bedford, Mass.

No Restriction on Travel except in the Tropics.

Policies Incontestable after Three years Annual payments, except in case of Fraud.

This Company offers as great inducements to those PAYING THEIR PREMIUMS ALL IN CASH as any in the country, at the same time giving them the privilege of availing themselves of the LOAN, should the necessity arise.

All Policies are Non-Forfeiting after Three Yearly Cash Payments have been made.

The Progress of this Company is shown by the Table Annexed.

New Policies.	No. of Policies issued each year.	Gross Receipts.	Amount Insured by New Policies.	Total Gross Assets.	Increase over previous year in Gross Assets.
Year 1862..	211	23,423	480,000	122,857	12,857
" 1863..	888	80,530	1,339,550	160,092	37,235
" 1864..	1,403	149,411	2,819,743	249,831	89,739
" 1865..	2,134	321,827	4,841,280	425,027	175,196
" 1866..	3,325	603,651	7,526,569	753,398	328,371
" 1867..	4,694	880,000	9,070,805	1,286,390	532,992
" 1868..	4,386	1,055,242	11,564,389	1,854,570	568,180

For General or District Agencies apply to the offices of the Company,
Nos. 31 and 33 Pine Street, New York.

Liberal Commissions to experienced Agents.

UNIVERSITY
OF THE
CITY OF NEW YORK.

The usual exercises will be resumed as follows, namely :

In the Preparatory or Grammar School Department,

On the 13th of September.

In the Department of Science and Letters,

September 15th.

In the Department of Art,

September 20th.

In the Department of Civil Engineering,

September 20th.

In the Department of Law,

October 4th.

In the Department of Analytical and Practical Chemistry,

October 13th.

In the Department of Medicine,

October 18th.

ISAAC FERRIS, Chancellor.

University, Washington Square, Aug., 1869.

Examinations for admission to the Department of Science and Letters will take place on TUESDAY, the 14th of September, at 9½ A. M., in the Council Room.

Rutgers Female College,

487, 489 & 491 Fifth Avenue,

NEW YORK CITY.

—:O:—

THIS INSTITUTION, which has enjoyed a high and wide reputation ever since its foundation in 1838, has now received from the Legislature of the State of New York a regular College Charter. The aim and purpose of the President and Trustees will now be to raise the standard of Ladies' education, and to afford the best facilities for acquiring a thorough and complete training, not only in those studies and accomplishments which are generally comprised in female education, but also in the classics and physical sciences; in short, to bring the course of study as nearly as possible to the level of that of our young men's colleges.

With this view, provision has been made for the pursuit of the Greek, Latin, German, and French Languages. The classical course is made optional after the close of the Sophomore year, so that pupils desirous of pursuing more fully other branches, either in modern languages or natural science, may have the opportunity of doing so.

The fine arts form a separate and independent department of study, under the personal charge of Mr. F. B. CARIENTER, and the supervision of Mr. HUNTINGTON, President of the National Academy of Design. Drawing in outline forms part of the regular course, but painting in oil or water-colors is not included, and is to be prosecuted by special studies.

Physiology, and several allied branches, are to be formed into the Department of Home Philosophy, the aim of which shall be to teach, on the widest scale possible in such institution, the applications of science to the conduct of every-day life.

In conformity with the plan in the OLD RUTGERS INSTITUTE, the COLLEGE will still maintain an Academic and a Preparatory School, at which children and young girls may study under the same system and influences as those of the COLLEGE itself.

The Terms in the Preparatory Department are \$100 per year; in the Academic, \$150, and in the College, \$200, with the exception of the Senior year, when the expenses of graduation are added to the annual rate, so as to make it \$250.

For further information, application may be made in person or by letter to

HENRY M. PIERCE, LL. D.,

PRESIDENT.

MR. VAN NORMAN'S
ENGLISH AND FRENCH
Family and Day School
FOR YOUNG LADIES,
 10 East Forty-sixth Street, New York.

—:O:—

The School Year extends from the fourth Thursday in September to the third Wednesday in June. The best facilities are afforded for the acquisition of the Modern Languages and Music. The French language is spoken in the family. Reference is made to the following gentlemen, whose daughters have been educated in the School :

MR. JOHN F. BUTTERWORTH, New York.	REV. CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D., New York.
MR. GEORGE F. CLARK, do.	C. R. DISOSWAY, Esq., do.
MR. EPINGHAM COCK, do.	REV. EDWIN F. HATFIELD, D.D., do.
CAPT. JOSEPH J. COMSTOCK, do.	HON. HENRY J. RAYMOND, do.
MR. JOHN B. DICKINSON, do.	REV. ABEL STEVENS, LL.D., do.
REV. CYRUS D. FOSS, do.	MR. JAMES BEATTY, do.
REV. R. S. FOSTER, D. D., do.	REV. JOHN M. STEVENSON, D.D., do.
REV. GEO. S. HARE, D. D., do.	JUDGE SIDNEY HUBBELL, Davenport, Iowa.
MR. CHARLES G. HARMER, do.	MR. AARON HEALY, Brooklyn, N. Y.
MR. CHARLES G. JUDSON, do.	COL. A. D. HOPE, Somerville, N. J.
MR. WILLIAM LECONY, do.	GEO. P. NELSON, Esq., Scarsdale, N. Y.
EDWARD VANDERPOEL, M. D., do.	CHARLES H. QUINLAN, M. D., Lake Forest,
MR. ABRAHAM H. CARDOZA, do.	Ill.
PROF. HARVEY B. LANE, do.	MR. E. V. ROBBINS, Chicago.
MR. THEODORE McNAMEE, do.	MR. AUGUSTUS F. SCOFIELD, Walden,
MR. SAMUEL PERRY, do.	N. Y.
ALFRED S. PURDY, M. D., do.	MR. EDWARD F. STEWART, Easton, Pa.
COL. C. SCHWARZWÄELDER, do.	MR. OSCAR F. AVERY, Chicago.
MR. BENJAMIN J. BRADLEY, Lyons, N. Y.	HON. JAMES BISHOP, New Brunswick, N. J.
MR. LEVI H. BRIGHAM, Brooklyn, N. Y.	MR. THOMAS W. CHACE, Providence, R. I.
WILLIAM BURKITT, M. D., Keokuk, Iowa.	MR. ORINGTON LUNT, Chicago.
REV. F. R. CLARK, D. D., Greenwich, Ct.	REV. JOHN MCCLINTOCK, D. D., LL. D.,
REV. B. W. DWIGHT, LL. D., Clinton, N. Y.	Madison, N. J.
MR. H. B. HATHORN, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	MR. HENRY MILLER, Sacramento, Cal.
MR. C. C. NORTH, Sing Sing, N. Y.	REV. JOHN F. MESSICK, D. D., Somerville,
JUDGE MONCRIEF, New York.	N. J.
REV. WM. G. T. SHELDON, D.D., New York.	REV. JOEL PARKER, D. D., Newark, N. J.
REV. J. RALSTON SMITH, D. D., New York.	REV. ASA D. SMITH, D. D., Pres. of Dart-
REV. JOHN GRAEF BARTON, Professor in	mouth Col.
College of New York.	REV. BISHOP THOMSON, D. D., Chicago.
GES. CLINTON B. FISK, St. Louis, Mo.	HON. MOSES MACDONALD, Portland Me.

For full information, see Circular, for which address as above.

Rev. D. C. Van Norman, LL.D.,

Principal.

MOUNT DE CHANTAL.

PARENTS AND GUARDIANS

Of Refinement and Cultivation, desiring for their daughters and wards the advantages
of a

FIRST-CLASS ENGLISH AND FRENCH SCHOOL,

WITH

MUSICAL INSTRUCTION,

Unsurpassed, if not unparalleled in this country, and all at MODERATE RATES, should
apply for the Prospectus of the

SISTERS OF THE VISITATION, MOUNT DE CHANTAL ACADEMY

NEAR WHEELING, W. VA.

REFERENCES, BY EXPRESS PERMISSION:

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP SPALDING, of Baltimore.
RT. REV. BISHOP WHELAN, of Wheeling.
REV. ISAAC T. HECKER, Superior of Paulist Fathers, New York.
GEN. SHELMAN, U. S. A., and Lady, Washington, D. C.
GEN. GEORGE MEADE, U. S. A., Philadelphia.
GEN. LAWRENCE P. GRAHAM, U. S. A., and Lady, Austin, Texas.
GEN. INNIS N. PALMER, U. S. A., and Lady, Omaha, Nebraska.
VICE-ADMIRAL D. D. PORTER, U. S. N., Washington, D. C.
MRS. ADMIRAL DAHLGREN, Washington, D. C.
MRS. DR. H. J. CULLEN, of Brooklyn, L. I.
EDW. L. SEARS, LL. D., of the National Quarterly Review, N. Y.

N. B.—This Academy possesses the additional attraction of being located on a beautiful eminence, about three miles from the city of Wheeling, W. Va., in the midst of exquisite scenery and with grounds comprising upwards of one hundred acres.

M^{LE}. ROSTAN'S
French and English Protestant School,
FOR YOUNG LADIES,
No. 111 East Thirty-Sixth Street,
WILL REOPEN ON
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21st.

The course of instruction is extensive and systematic, and designed
to combine a

Thorough English Education

WITH THE

Practical knowledge of the French and other Modern Languages.

SPECIAL ATTENTION IS ALSO GIVEN TO

DRAWING AND PAINTING;

AND THE

MUSICAL DEPARTMENT,

under the care of

PROFESSORS S. B. MILLS AND F. L. RITTER,

Offers peculiar advantages to those who wish to make music a special study.

Lectures on the NATURAL SCIENCES, HISTORY, &c., are delivered weekly
by eminent Professors.

A limited number of young ladies will be received in the family, and
welcomed to share in all the comforts and privileges of a pleasant home.

STATEMENT OF THE Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Comp'y

FOR THE YEAR ENDING JANUARY 1ST, 1869.

Premiums received during the year.....	\$1,743,173 35	
Interest received during the year.....	187,669 19	
Total Income for the year.....		\$1,930,833 54

DISBURSEMENTS.

Paid claims by death on 87 policies.....	\$166,950 66	
Paid commission and salaries to agents.....	229,575 51	
Paid dividends, and for policies surrendered.....	148,579 75	
Paid physicians' fees, salaries, taxes, printing, postage, and other expenses.....	113,322 92	
Total Expenditures during year.....		\$658,419 84

ASSETS.

Loans on real estate.....	\$764,900 00	
Bank stocks and railroad bonds.....	213,150 00	
U. S. Registered and State bonds.....	198,565 00	
Hartford City Gas Light company stock.....	8,925 00	
Loans on collateral security.....	28,442 58	
Bills receivable, amply secured.....	1,898,624 00	
Furniture in home and branch office.....	12,654 83	
Cash on hand and in banks.....	195,624 53	
Accrued interest and deferred premiums.....	86,778 71	
Amount in the hands of agents, and in course of transmission.....	256,365 53	
Total assets of the Company.....		\$3,664,060 18
Number of policies issued during the year.....	8,229	
Amount insured during the year.....	\$22,523,549 00	
Total amount of losses paid.....		700,625 00

Table of Comparisons of the Business of 1866, '67 and '68, OF THE PHOENIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMP'Y.

Number of policies issued in 1866.....	4708	Income in 1866.....	\$848,607 71
" " " 1867.....	5811	" 1867.....	1,179,044 28
" " " 1868.....	8,229	" 1868.....	1,930,833 00
Increase of 1867 over 1866— 41 per cent.		Increase of 1867 over 1866— 38 per cent.	
" 1868 " 1866—100 "		" 1868 " 1866—128 "	
Amount insured in 1866.....	\$9,137,909	Assets in 1866.....	\$1,457,314 99
" " 1867.....	15,250,930	" 1867.....	2,218,334 38
" " 1868.....	22,523,549	" 1868.....	3,664,060 15
Increase of 1867 over 1866— 67 per cent.		Increase of 1867 over 1866— 52 per cent.	
" 1868 " 1866—146 "		" 1868 " 1866—151 "	
Received from interest in 1867.....	\$120,790 23		
Paid in losses in 1867.....	107,700 00		
Received for interest over losses paid.....			\$13,099 23
Received from interest in 1868.....	\$187,669 19		
Paid in losses in 1868.....	166,950 66		
Received for interest over losses paid.....			20,709 53
			\$33,808 76

J. F. BURNS, Secretary.

**E. FESSENDEN,
President.**

COLLEGE

OF THE

Christian Brothers,

ST. LOUIS, MO., 1868.

This Literary Institution possesses all the advantages of an agreeable and healthy location, easy of access, being situated on a rising ground, a little southwest of the Pacific Railroad terminus in the city of St. Louis, Missouri. It was founded in 1851, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, incorporated in 1855 by the State Legislature, and empowered to confer degrees and academical honors. However favorable the auspices under which it commenced its literary career, its progress since has surpassed all anticipation. Growing equally in public confidence and in the number of students, it has gone on extending its reputation. Repeated additions have been made to the original buildings. The number of Students received within the last year amounted to more than 600, and many applicants were refused admission for want of room.

Every possible attention is paid to whatever can contribute to the health and happiness of its inmates—ventilation, cleanliness, spacious halls, dormitories, refectory, recreation halls for cold or damp weather, etc., etc.

The various arts and sciences usually taught in colleges find here an appropriate place in a system of education established by experience, conducted on the most approved plan, and with a devotedness commensurate with the greatness of the work engaged in. By reason of the great number of classes, a thorough gradation for all capacities and acquisitions has been attained, and the frequent examinations and promotions beget emulation, the soul of advancement, making labor a pleasure, and success certainty.

The course of instruction pursued in the Academy is divided into three departments: the primary, the intermediate, and the collegiate. There is, beside, an exclusively commercial course, offering rare advantages to young gentlemen who intend to make business their profession. It is divided into three classes, in which the chief place is given to instruction in Book-keeping, Arithmetic, Geography, and History, Business Forms and Correspondence, Epistolary Composition, Penmanship, etc., with Lectures on Commercial Law, Political Economy, etc. Diplomas can be obtained in the Commercial Department by such as merit that distinction.

The session commences on the last Monday in August, and ends about the 31 of July, with an annual public examination and distribution of premiums, and the conferring of degrees and academical honors.

On the completion of the course the degree of A. B. is conferred upon such students as, on examination are found worthy of that distinction. The degree of A. M. can be obtained by graduates in the first degree after two years devoted to some scientific or literary pursuit, their moral character remaining unexceptionable.

The government is a union of mildness and firmness, energy, and kindness, a blending of paternal solicitude with fraternal sympathy; the results of which are contentment, good order and happiness. The morals and general deportment of the students are constantly watched over; Brothers preside at their recreations, and their comfort and personal habits receive every attention.

TERMS.

Entrance Fee.....	\$8 00
Board and Tuition, per session.....	250 00
Washing.....	20 00
Physician's Fee.....	8 00
For Half-Boarders.....	100 00
For Day Scholars.....	60 00
In the Senior Class.....	40 00
Vacation at the Institution.....	40 00

Music, Drawing, and the use of apparatus in the study of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy form extra charges.

N. B.—Payments semi-annually and invariably in advance.

No deduction for absence, except in case of protracted illness or dismissal.

*. No extra charges for the study of the German, French, and Spanish languages.

Loretto Abbey of the Holy Family,

TORONTO, ONT.

SEMINARY FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG LADIES,

UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE LADIES OF LORETTO.

Loretto Abbey, a spacious and splendid mansion, situated conveniently near the business part of the city, yet sufficiently remote to secure the quiet and seclusion so congenial to study, combines the advantages of the city with those of the country, having the full benefit of the pure air of the Lake, whilst it is both sheltered and ornamented by a beautiful belt of forest trees surrounding the shrubbery.

The Course of Instruction in this establishment comprises every branch suitable to the complete education of young ladies, with the strictest attention to their moral and polite department.

The uniform of the house, which each young lady will require, is a light blue dress for summer, and a dark blue for winter. She will also require two dressing-gowns, two black aprons, one black and one white lace veil, five changes of linen, bed, bedding, knife, silver fork, dessert and teaspoons; four table napkins. Bed and bedding supplied by the institution at an extra of \$6.

The academic year commences on the first of September, and ends on the first week of July. Pupils will be received at any time during the year, but not for a shorter period than five months.

References are required from the pupils on entering.

Payments in gold, or its equivalent, to be made half yearly, and in advance.

TERMS:

Board and tuition in the usual branches of an English and French education, \$100 per annum.

	PER ANNUM.		PER ANNUM.
Piano.....	\$24 00	German.....	12 00
Use of Piano.....	8 00	Drawing or Painting.....	16 00
Harp, and use of instrument.....	38 00	Wax Flowers per course.....	5 00
Guitar.....	24 00	Stationery.....	3 00
Vocal Music.....	16 00	Oil Painting.....	24 00
Washing.....	12 00	Fuel.....	2 00
Italian.....	12 00		

Letters of inquiry may be addressed to the

LADY SUPERIOR,

Loretto Abbey, Wellington Place, Toronto.

THE LORETTO CONVENT,

Niagara Falls, Ont.,

IS ALSO UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LADIES OF LORETTO.

This Institution is beautifully situated on a high and healthy location, overlooking the Falls on the Canadian side, and can not be equalled for the sublime and extensive view which it affords of the Falls, Rapids, and Islands in the vicinity.

Letters of inquiry may be addressed to the LADY SUPERIOR, LORETTO CONVENT, Niagara Falls, Clifton P. O., Ontario.

KNICKERBOCKER Life Insurance Company

OF THE

CITY OF NEW YORK.

Principal Office, 161 Broadway.

ERASTUS LYMAN, GEORGE F. SNIFFEN,

PRESIDENT.

SECRETARY.

Assets,	\$5,500,000 00
Amount paid to Widows and Orphans of Deceased Members, over	1,200,000 00
Surplus Dividends paid in Cash and added to Insurance, over	650,000 00
Members Insured in 1868,—10,722	
Amount Insured in 1868,	33,073,000 00

PROGRESS OF THE COMPANY.

	New Policies Issued.	Amount Insured.
1866	5,450	\$17,000,000
1867	10,284	31,310,725
1868	10,722	33,073,000

ASSETS.

1866	Dec. 31st.	\$1,569,929
1867	"	3,077,553
1868	"	5,170,500

EVERY DESIRABLE FORM OF POLICY

Issued from \$1,000 to \$25,000 on a single life.

BRANCH OFFICES.

CHICAGO—CHICAGO, ILLS.	For States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Ohio.	S. A. MATTISON, MANAGER.
SOUTH-EASTERN—BALTIMORE, MD.	For States of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia.	JOHN A. NICHOLS, MANAGER.
SOUTHERN—SAVANNAH, GA.	For States of Georgia, the Carolinas, Florida, and Alabama.	AARON WILBUR, MANAGER.
SOUTH-WESTERN—NEW ORLEANS, LA.	For States of Louisiana, Texas, Kansas, and Southern Mississippi.	H. C. PAXSON, MANAGER.
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—MEMPHIS, TENN.	For States of Kentucky, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Northern Mississippi.	S. R. CLARKE & CO., MANAGER.
HOME DISTRICT—161 BROADWAY, N. Y.	For States of New-York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Rhode-Island. General Agency in Penn.	H. LASSING, MANAGER.

APPROVED SCHOOL-BOOKS,

PUBLISHED BY

E. H. BUTLER & CO.,**137 South Fourth Street, Phila., Pa.****Mitchell's New School Geographies.**

MITCHELL'S FIRST LESSONS IN GEOGRAPHY. For young children. An introduction to the Author's Primary Geography. With maps and engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW PRIMARY GEOGRAPHY. Illustrated by Twenty Colored Maps and One Hundred Engravings. Designed as an introduction to the New Intermediate Geography.

MITCHELL'S NEW INTERMEDIATE GEOGRAPHY. For the use of Schools and Academies. Illustrated by Twenty-three Copper-Plate Maps and numerous Engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW SCHOOL GEOGRAPHY AND ATLAS. A System of Modern Geography—Physical, Political, and Descriptive; accompanied by a new Atlas of Forty-four Copper-Plate Maps, and Illustrated by Two Hundred Engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY. With Thirteen Copper-Plate Maps, and One Hundred and Fifty Engravings. By John Brocklesby, A. M., Professor of Mathematics in Trinity College.

MITCHELL'S NEW OUTLINE MAPS. A series of Seven Maps, handsomely colored and mounted, in size 24 by 28 inches, except the Map of the United States, which is 28 by 48 inches. They clearly and fully represent, at a glance, the Political Boundaries, Mountain-Systems, River Courses, Plateaus, Plains, and Deserts of the Earth.

MITCHELL'S NEW ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY. An entirely new work, elegantly illustrated.

▲ **HAND-BOOK OF MAP-DRAWING.** By Peter Kearn and John Mickleborough, especially adapted to the Maps in Mitchell's Series of Geographies.

Goodrich's School Histories.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

GOODRICH'S AMERICAN CHILD'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. A Pictorial History of the United States, with notices of other Portions of America. By S. G. Goodrich, author of "Peter Parley's Tales."

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ROME.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF GREECE.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF FRANCE.

GOODRICH'S PARLEY'S COMMON SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE WORLD.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL NATURAL HISTORY.

BINGHAM'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. For the use of Schools and Academies. With copious parsing exercises. By Wm. Bingham, A. M. Superintendent of the Bingham School.

BINGHAM'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Grammar of the Latin Language. For the use of Schools. With exercises and vocabularies. By Wm. Bingham, A. M.

BINGHAM'S LATIN READER. Adapted to Bingham's Latin Grammar. With Notes and a vocabulary.

BINGHAM'S CÆSAR. Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War. With critical and explanatory notes, vocabulary, and a new Map of Gaul. By Wm. Bingham, A. M.

COPPEE'S ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. Designed as a Manual of Instruction. By Henry Coppee, LL.D., President of Lehigh University.

COPPEE'S ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC. Designed as a Manual of Instruction. By Henry Coppee, LL.D.

HOWE'S PRIMARY LADIES' READER. A choice and varied Collection of Prose and Poetry, adapted to the capacities of Young Children. By John W. S. Howe, Professor of Elocution.

HOWE'S JUNIOR LADIES' READER.

HOWE'S LADIES' READER.

HOWE'S LADIES' BOOK OF READINGS AND RECITATIONS.

Martindale's Series of Spellers.

THE PRIMARY SPELLER. For young children. Designed as an Introduction to the Author's Common-School Speller. By Joseph C. Martindale, Principal of the Madison Grammar School, Philadelphia.

THE COMMON-SCHOOL SPELLER. Second book of the series. Designed as an Introduction to the Author's Complete Speller. By Joseph C. Martindale.

THE COMPLETE SPELLER. For Schools and Academies. Arranged to facilitate the study of the Orthography and Pronunciation of the English Language. By Joseph C. Martindale.

SMITH'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. English Grammar on the Productive System. By Roswell C. Smith.

SCHOLAR'S COMPANION. Containing exercises in Orthography, Derivation, and Classification of English Words. New edition. By Rufus W. Bailey.

STOCKHARDT'S CHEMISTRY. The Principles of Chemistry, illustrated by simple experiments. By Dr. Julius Adolph Stockhardt, Professor in the Royal Academy of Agriculture, at Tharand. Translated by Prof. C. H. Pierce, of Harvard College.

TENNEY'S GEOLOGY. Geology for Teachers, Classes, and Private Students. By Sanborn Tenney, A. M., Professor of Natural History in Vassar Female College. Illustrated with Two Hundred Engravings.

Teachers and Boards of Education are respectfully invited to address the Publishers, for further information regarding these Books, all of which are eminently suited for the School-room.

THE
NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. XXXIX.

DECEMBER, 1869.

- ART. I.—1. *Ägyptens stelle in der Weltgeschichte Geschichtliche Untersuchung.* In 5 Büchern. (Egypt's place in the world's History). Von C. C. J. BUNSEN. Hamburg.
2. *Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology.* By COL. VANS KENNEDY. London.
3. *Philosophy and Wisdom of the Hindus.* By Prof. SCHLEGEL. Berlin.
4. *Le Rik Veda ou livre des hymnes traduit en Français.* Par M. LANGLOIS, membre de l'Institut. Paris.
5. *Antiquities and Literature of Asiatic Nations; also African.* By Professor HEEREN. Berlin.
6. *Les Vedas.* Par J. BARTHELÉMEY ST. HILAIRE, Paris.
7. *The Mythology of the Hindus, copiously illustrated, and with drawings of the Temples.* C. COLEMAN. London.
8. *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature in so far as it illustrates the Primitive religion of the Brahmans.* By MAX MÜLLER. London.
9. *The complete works of Sir William Jones, F.R.S.* In 13 vols. London.

THE object of mythology is to effect a union between the divine and the human, between spirit and nature. But in the very effort to express in words the idea of this connection, language is enriched and developed in an extraordinary degree; and it may be asserted that if it had not been for religion, lan-

guage must have been confined to a few score words. The study, therefore, of the ancient mythologies, will always rest, in no small degree, on philology; and researches in the one entail labor in the other. It is for this reason that the Greeks and Romans never understood the origin of their respective faiths. Writers of the highest rank among the latter, like Cicero, did not hesitate to affirm that their gods were borrowed from the former.* And both Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus believed that they were indebted to the Egyptians for their own. Yet if there be one ancient fact well established by modern scholars, it is, that the great gods of Greece and Rome are distinct, and cannot be studied together, and that there is an affinity so close between the Greek and Hindu mythologies, that to study them apart is to prejudice greatly the cause of history.†

The system of ancient theogonists was remarkably simple. Was a continent called Europa, straightway a Princess Europa is invented, who dwells in Asia Minor, and who is carried by Zeus, in the form of a bull, across the Hellespont, to the land that now bears her name. In the same manner the origin of the Ionians is to be traced to Io, whom Zeus embraces as a cloud; and the name of the Greeks, Danaï, to another princess, Danaë, an inaccessible tower, and Zeus again as a shower of gold. The Hellespont, in like manner, is so called because Hellas, in riding on the ram with the golden fleece, was drowned there. The Palatine Hill in Rome takes its name after the same extraordinary system of derivations, from Pallas and Evander, companions of Æneas, who settled there.

The invention of these historians was not very acute. Zeus is called in too often, and princesses are invented with a too fatal iteration; but the generation for whom these childish tales were produced was not a critical one, and they passed unchallenged. And the moderns accepted them for a long time with an undeviating faith, that seems to us of the present era marvellous, till Niebuhr, in his lectures on

* De Univeristate.

† Schlegel, *Literature and Wisdom of the Hindus*, book i., p. 46.

Roman history, broke the spell. Then the authority of the ancients, in this respect, vanished for ever, and the school of modern days began to analyse and to deduce, to induct and build up, without the slightest regard to the ancient writers. The laws of language were developed, and the workings and growth of the human intellect were systematized and made to bear witness to the secrets of the past; and, as a result, mythology became the brightest lamp that the historian finds to guide his footsteps in the gloom of remote ages.

The Hindu mythology is especially valuable for its antiquity, for its literary productions, and for that undeniable connection with Grecian theogony which Schlegel has pointed out, and which Max Müller has proved.* There was, indeed, a time when this value was doubtful. When, through the efforts of Sir William Jones, the learned jurist of Calcutta, the treasures of Sanskrit sacred verse were given to the world, men sought in it the key to an exact knowledge of early history, and more especially that of the Aryan race. But at a first glance the Hindu records seem so contradictory, fabulous histories are so mingled with narratives of real facts, the modern is so inextricably united to the ancient, that a reaction soon took place, and many scholars doubted if there was anything worthy of scrutiny in the Hindu theogonies; and some even denied, *in toto*, their antiquity. Of these, Dr. Bentley, of the "Quarterly Review," was the chief, and that periodical teemed with articles which had for their aim the utter extinction of Sanskrit investigation. But Bentley and his merry men and their opinions have passed away. An age has arisen which knows not that sanguinary critic, and stands in no fear of being killed like poor Keats. The common consent of all intelligent writers is given to the antiquity of the Vedas; and since it is with these and the religion to which they refer that the Greek affinity is strongest, the most material point may be considered undisputed. For whatever may be the philosophic value of Greek writings, so dear is the affection borne for everything Hellenic, that for the majority of readers, the subject of Hindu mythology is only valuable as it relates to Greece and Grecian myths.

* Max Müller, *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, book i.

But it must be stated, that, from a philological view, the connection of the Vedas is strongest with the Latins. This does not so forcibly appear in the mythology as in the language, where word after word can be traced to a Vedic origin. Thus Agni, the Vedic god of fire, is found in *ignis*, whilst the Greek word seems identical with the German *feuer*. These resemblances are considered by competent authorities to point out that the Pelasgian races, those early forms of Hellenism, had a direct communication with the Hindu Aryans at the time that the Vedic was a spoken language. In this particular, Bopp, the learned comparative philologist, has done great service, by following up the hint given by Niebuhr, who saw in the Latin language the proofs of a mixed origin.

The time of connection between the Pelasgi and the Aryans in Bactria, must have been very remote. The era of the present Hindus is that of Vikramaditya, who certainly reigned some time before Christ; their date of this year being 1920, which would make it fifty-one years precisely before the Christian epoch. At that time Sanskrit was a dead language, and had been replaced by Pali. In the visit of Megasthenes, the ambassador of Seleucus Nicanor, to the court of Sandrokottus, at Palibothra,* a very accurate and graphic sketch is given of Hindu social customs, caste, luxury and learning; and at that time, too, Sanskrit was a dead language. But at the time when the Pelasgi were Aryans in Bactria, Sanskrit had not been evolved, and it is possible that it arose out of the supremacy of the Brahminical caste, which was one of the causes of the Aryan emigration. Therefore the conclusion seems inevitable, from what we know of the origin, progress, and decay of language, that this earliest phase of Pelasgianism must have taken place many thousands of years before the era of Vikramaditya.

The "Samhita," or collection of the Vedas, is a compendium of sacred poems in honor of the elemental gods of the ancient Aryan race. These hymns are not in their origin liturgical, but have been used as such for many centuries; and the divisions in which we now find them, into *ashtakas*

* The modern Allahabad, at the junction of the Jumna and the Ganges.

and mandalas, is as arbitrary as the arrangement of our own 119th psalm, and for exactly the same reason—the convenience of the reader or singer. But they are not written in Sanskrit, but in a language which was a living one before Sanskrit had developed itself at all.* This is called the Vedic, or Bactrian,† because, at the time it was used, we know, from internal evidence, that the Aryans, or Hindus, occupied Bactria. By that name we mean the lands which stretch from the modern Cabul to the shores of the Indus. It is conjectured that the Aryans emigrated from the garden of Eden, or the land between the Euphrates and the Gihon, through the climateric change brought on by the deluge.‡ To enter into a detailed history of their wanderings would be unnecessary in a review of their mythology. It is sufficient for us, that at the time they inhabited Bactria they still worshipped elemental deities. Their gods were *Api*, the god of fire (*ignis*), and *Indra*, or the vault of heaven (*Cœlano*)—these were the chief; the inferior deities, the *dii minores*, were *Mitra*, the sun, *Vaya*, god of the winds, *Varuna*, of the sea, the *Maruts*, or Winds, and the *Aswini Kumara*, or twin children of Bahvani.

With reference to these, it will be observed that the confusion of ancient and modern things, of which we have spoken, manifests itself here. The *Aswini Kumara* are recorded as children of Bahvani, yet Bahvani is not a Vedic deity, and could not belong to a religion of elemental worship. This has, unfortunately, not been pointed out by the French philologist, whose work on the Vedas is considered the standard authority. Yet Aswini Kumara are the twins of the Hindu zodiac, the Castor and Pollux of Hindostan, and, like them, symbols of the constellation Gemini. As the sons of Bahvani, or nature, they are offshoots of an astral cosmic religion, which has no affinity with the Vedic. We are therefore under the necessity of considering those hymns, where they occur, as of late origin.

Yet we have observed that it was precisely with the Vedic

* Barthelemy St. Hilaire, *Les Vedas*, Lib. i., p. 17.

† Bunsen, *Place of Egypt in Universal History*, book iv.

‡ *Ibid.*

phase of Hindu mythology that the Hellenic myths had affinity. Here is an undoubted case of identity with Castor and Pollux, and yet the Aswini Kumara must be rejected from the Vedic deities, because the worship of stars or constellations belongs to another system differing widely from the Vedic. It is plain, then, that the intruding element to which the Aswini Kumara belong, must also have intruded upon the Greeks, which, from the word Hellenes, we believe, were once exclusively sun worshippers.

Varuna is also given as god of the sea. Yet it is difficult to understand how the Aryans, an inland race, whose ears had never been filled by the music of the murmuring waves, and whose feet had never wandered on the yellow sea sands, could have worshipped a deity of the sea—an abstraction.

This acceptance is universal, from the oldest writer* on the subject to the latest. From a philological examination, it would seem that *Varuna* and *Ouranos* are identical; nor is there anything in the early hymns contrary to the opinion that Indra was the great unseen god, and that Varuna typified the vault of heaven. In the theogony of Hesiod, Ouranos is the husband of Gaia, the earth, and devours his children as fast as they are produced, the myth evidently meaning that there were previous creations which became again chaos. Chronos (time) mutilates his father, and prevents him from having more children, meaning that there came a time when the primal creating power ceased to act.

In the Hindu Varuna however, there is nothing cosmic; he is simply a celestial deity, who battles with the clouds. There is evidence here again that a foreign element, an astral-cosmic one, has intruded itself upon the Greek mythology, but, in this case, has spared the Hindu.

The earliest god of the Vedic Aryans is unquestionably Agni,† and probably had its origin in the discovery of the domestic uses of fire. It is difficult for the nineteenth century readers to carry back their imaginations so far as to realize a time when the use of fire was unknown. But to such an age the worship of anything so useful, so

* Pomey's *Pantheum Mythologicum*.

† Barthelemy St. Hilaire.

comfortable, would follow as inevitable. We find among the Greek domestic deities the *prytanei*, and it is recorded of Æneas that he carried from Troy his penates, the palladium, and the sacred fire. It is also recorded, in exceedingly doubtful Roman historians, that Lavinia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, was one of the vestal virgins who guarded the same pure flame, when she was surprised by Mars, and made the mother of the Roman twins.

In Persia, the Irans were so strongly wedded to this worship that when Zarathustra developed his doctrine of the dual principles Ormuzd and Ahriman, he was obliged to permit the adoration of fire as one of the forms of beneficence vouchsafed to man by the Deity. And so great is the devotion of the modern Parsi to this idea, that he refuses to smoke, since it would be a desecration of the sacred emblem; and when railroads were introduced into the Guzerat, there was a strong contention whether it were permissible to ride on the *fire-chariot*.

In Cutch, where the inhabitants are Hindus, mostly of the Suryawansi caste, the universal practice is to place small portions of food among the embers before commencing the repast. This is probably the relic of an old oblation to fire, though it must be acknowledged that Surya, the sun, is the principal deity of this people, and it may be an acknowledgment of the blessings given by the sun.

The idea entertained of Agni was peculiar. At first worshipped as a great God, he became afterwards the divine mediator between Indra and man—the *bearer of sacrifice*. In the hymn to Agni, composed by the seer, Vashista, this conception is clearly brought out.

“Like the lover of the dawn, Agni sends forth his rays, he develops all his fires. Pure, fertile, luminous, resplendant, he has come at the prayer of the worshippers who invoke him. Like the sun, Agni has shone with the dawn that brings back the day, and whilst the priests recite the prayer, he makes ready the sacrifice; for Agni is the holy deity who becomes the benevolent mediator between mortals and the gods.

“By him prayers and saintly meditations ascend to the gods. They

raise themselves to Agni, to whom they supplicate with ardor, to Agni the agreeable, Agni the charming, the generous bearer of sacrifice.

"O Agni, bring to us Indra with the Vasus. Unite with him Rudra, and with Rudra, Aditi, who is the parent of all things, and the Adityas. Thus supplicates the rich Vrihaspati, with the poets who chant the praises of the protecting gods. The people in the midst of the sacrifice celebrate Agni, who makes our joy—Agni the ever youthful priest who gives us fire; for it is he who, morning and evening, has ever been the indefatigable messenger whom rich men employ to address themselves to the deities."

The picture presented here is a very pleasant one. It seems the Aryans worshipped at sunrise and sunset, and it is probable that this practice arose from sun worship. The hymns to the sun are more probably poems in which the author celebrates the beauty of nature in the early morning, and the glowing blushes of the dawn before her lover the sun-god Mitra. References to the sun-lover, who follows the blushing goddess, occur almost everywhere in the Vedic hymns, and one of the commonest titles of the sun is "lover of the dawn." The resemblance to the myth of Apollo, who pursues Daphne and overtakes her only to find her vanish amid the fragrance of the laurel, is undoubtedly identical with this myth. And the description of the Hindu sun-god, in his resplendant chariot drawn by shining coursers, is almost, word for word—is certainly idea for idea, similar to the Grecian myth of the chariot of Phœbus Apollo. The sun in many of the Vedic hymns is called the resplendant torch of the deities, the eye of Mitra the sun-god, of Varuna and of Agni. This would seem strong confirmation of the idea that Varuna is to be considered as Ouranos, the blue vault of heaven, and not the god of the sea.

Aditi, whom Agni is requested to bring in the train of Rudra, another name for Varuna, but afterwards appropriated by the robber Shiva, would seem to be the night—the fruitful mother of all existing things. The word Aditi is not-day, and the children of the night, the Adityas, in this early age were evidently regarded as beneficent beings. In later times they are ranked with the Asuras or demons, whose name has, by the bye, the same derivation, Sura being the name for the sun's disk. There was an old Greek legend that all

things were created by Nox and Erebus ; the meaning being, probably, that all things arose from primeval darkness and love. This would seem hinted at in the hymn to Agni.

The hymns to Indra* are certainly of a later date, and reveal a changed condition, more civilized but less happy. The votaries request to be made rich in downright terms, and speak with unfeigned rapture of treasure cities and chariots laden with precious things. The Asenas are recognized as demons, under a leader, Sambara, who is destroyed by Indra. Indra also slays Ahi, and Bala, who was climbing to heaven, and is generally a warlike god. He leads the warriors to battle, and they invoke him in the combat. He sits upon a cloud, and slays his enemies with his lightnings. He accepts libations, offerings, and hymns, and appears in every particular to correspond, not with Zeus, but with Jupiter, the Pelasgian deity, whose actions and characteristics are as distinct from the amorous cloud-compeller who quarrels with Hera, as the mind can possibly conceive.† Any one whose researches have been carried back to the earliest records of the Greek and Roman people, must be sufficiently alive to the difference existing between them to feel that Jupiter and Zeus are distinct creations ; so also Venus and Aphrodite, Mars and Ares, Mercury and Hermes. This error has, however, crept into the consideration of the Hindu mythology, and competent authorities have pronounced Indra to be identical with Zeus. Indra is represented everywhere, indeed, as the king of heaven and of men ; but this is a characteristic common to all ruling deities, and applies to Jupiter, *divum pater atque hominum rex*, equally with Zeus, *αἰεὶ ἀνδρῶν*.

The change in the condition of the Hindus is also marked in the sacrifice. Indra receives now libations, sacrifices, and hymns. Formerly the offering was simply the burning of ghee (clarified butter) in the holy flame. It is probable that the libations were made exactly in the fashion recorded by Latin authors. It is difficult for any one who

* Barthélemy St. Hilaire, *Les Vedas. Hymne à Indra*, par Gritsamada.

† Schlegel, *Literature and Wisdom of the Hindus*, book I., p. 466.

has not witnessed the funeral ceremonials of a Hindu, to believe how closely it follows the account given by Virgil in the *Æneid*, when the hero pays the last rites to a departed companion. The libations, the arrangement on the pyre, the conduct of the relations, the chanting of the priests, all are identical. It may, therefore, well be imagined, and with a reasonable hope of accuracy, that the ceremonials of Indra did not differ materially from those of Jupiter, the solemn protector of Rome.

That the Adityas became demons is not contrary to what we read in Greek and Roman mythologies. Plutarch's idea was, that the most virtuous human souls became heroes, and that these in course of time became demons, and of these a small number became divine, and were worshipped as deities by mankind. These demons, according to him, were good, beneficent beings, ministers and messengers of the gods.* Yet, in course of time the word had an evil signification, and the demons, though still servants of the *dii majores*, were only used to punish and to affright. Whether this explanation of the changed belief in the Adityas be as correct as the idea advanced by a German mythologist,† that the words Adityas Asuras, and Dityas Suryas, simply have reference to a line of princes who claimed descent from the sun as the Peruvian Incas, will be hard to determine. But one thing must be pointed out, that the Hindu does not recognize the demons as having any effect on human life, as our Greek and Roman friends believed. The doctrine of metempsychosis forbid such a belief; nor did they ever hold that the glorified souls of man became in any way connected with their theogony. This was also impossible, from the very nature of the theory of emanation; for this doctrine explained that all things emanated from Brahm, the divine essence, and would in time return to it again. The good or evil conduct of an individual would be rewarded by an advance to assimilation, or punished by a descent in the scale into some animal whose vices the human being had imitated. This was the doctrine of metempsychosis, taught, indeed, by Pythagoras

* *Opinion Philosoph.*, lib. i., c. 8. † Bunsen, *Place of Egypt*, book v.

in Greece, but never having any effect on the Hellenic mind.

Nor was there any trace of this doctrine among the Pelasgians, who are confessedly nearer to the Hindu Aryans than any other; the theory of the Greeks, Romans, and allied races, being altogether dissimilar. It was an accepted fact among the ancients, that each individual had his tutelary demon, or guardian spirit, and, unquestionably, Plutarch points to this faith. That the spirits of the dead should minister to the living was a beautiful and noble idea. But it finds no parallel in any Hindu belief, and is only met with among the ancient Lithuanians, which has been received in modern times by Etienne Garczynski, the philosopher and poet of Posen. "*Les esprits lithuaniens*," says Miczewicz, "*placent dans le monde spirituel le centre de toute action, et regardent le monde visible et les hommes comme des instruments.*" And, again, he quotes from Lithuanian writers: "*Toute force reside dans le génie de l'homme.*" This was exactly the Roman idea of the tutelary demon. But the Hindu Asuras and Adityas are simply enemies of the gods, and contend with them in heaven, but never meddle with earthly matters. They are in no wise to be compared with the demons proper, but rather to the history of the Titans, and their great leader Jalandhara to Typhon.

Between the Vedic literature and the Sanskrit, in which the Smriti, or Institutes of Manu, are written, there is a great gulf, which history at present is powerless to bridge over. Between the death of one language and the birth of another, what events may not have transpired? Schlegel has pointed out that a language is never uprooted, save by some violent convulsion, and, though we do not know the fact, we may imagine that a long and dreadful series of intestine wars must fill that remarkable cleft. Nor can we say how or when the idea of Brahm, the divine essence, originated. The language of the Rig-Veda is so extraordinary as to warrant the supposition of divine revelation. "Eternel, tout-puissant, incompréhensible, infini, être qui existe de soi-même," is the translation of a French author.* Nor

* M. Langlois, *Le Rik-Veda traduit en Français*, vol. i., p. 84.

can we reconcile these words with any idea of human unaided intellect. We are forced to admit either that the Hindu possessed a divine revelation, or that the Brahminic philosophy of emanation arrived at the same result. Taken also from the Rig-Veda, the rendition of an English translator is as follows: "He who sees everything, but is never seen; he who is not to be compassed by description, and is beyond the limits of human conception; he from whom the universal world proceeds, who is the soul of the universe, whose name is too sacred to be pronounced, and whose power is too infinite to be imagined, is Brahm, the one unknown, true being, the creator, the preserver and destroyer of the universe."* This is unquestionably a picture of the true God. Nor has any Hebrew poet, however grand in his diction and inspired in his ideas, given a better.

The word too sacred for pronunciation was not Brahm, but *Om*. In the Parsi theogony, a mystic marriage takes place between Hom and Messies, and this is explained as the mystical union between the soul of man and the infinite God.† It will be remembered that the Hebrews had also a sacred name for the deity, which was never pronounced, and which, by an error of the translators, has been given as Jehovah, though it really was *Iao*.‡ The points of connection between the Parsi, Hebrews and Hindu are here too strong to be ignored, and it is presumable that that small and scant people known as the Hebrews are only an offshoot of the great Bactrian Aryans, and did not receive exclusively any divine relation, but simply shared in that made to the whole Aryan race.

We know that there was a dispersion of Aryans from Bactria by the Zend-avesta. Bunsen has very learnedly analyzed and compared this with the Vedas, and has come to the conclusion that there was a heresy among the Bactrian Aryans upon the subject of the supremacy of Indra, who is, accordingly, depicted in the Parsi writings as Aindra, an evil spirit of great potency and malignant disposition. The

*Col. Vans Kennedy, p. 83.

† Bunsen, *Place of Egypt in the World's History*. ‡ *Idem*.

great cleft between the Vedic language and the Sanskrit, in all probability was occasioned by this struggle. It may also be that there was an objection to the Brahmin caste, whose germ must, about this period, have just manifested itself, probably recommending itself to the people by great austerity of life and feigned piety. It is in this manner, according to the Puranas, or purely Brahmanic hymns, that the demons (Asuras) and all evil-disposed spirits deceived the good Brahma and the unsuspecting Vishnu, and won for themselves extraordinary powers as a reward, which they immediately put to the worst uses. Thus Maha Bali, a dwarf of immense pretension to piety, and possessing seven heads, approaches Brahma, with oblation, and cuts off, one after the other, six of his heads, whereupon Brahma, to reward such piety, promises him whatever he shall ask. He immediately demands the empire of heaven, earth, and hell, but is circumvented subsequently by Shiva, who approaches him in the guise of a pious Brahman.

From the hints offered by other historians, we may believe that the idea of an hereditary priesthood existed in Vedic times, that is, before the forced emigration of the Iranians, the Pelasgi, and the Eirians, or Irish. For we observe that the last mentioned had their Druids, and their bards seem identical with the Rishis of the Vedas. This word, translated *author* by Barthélemy St. Hilaire, is by others taken to mean *prophet*, or *seer*, and by some even is considered synonymous with *saint*. But if we remember the union between poetry and prophecy in those remote ages, and that fasting and an austere life were then deemed essential conditions of inspiration, (as it was until almost recent times among the Gaels of the Scottish mountains,) we shall see that *author*, *poet*, *prophet*, and *saint* are all attributes of the one character.

There is, also, in the various names Danoi, Argureoi, Dorioi, given to the Hellenes, a trace of caste. We may interpret these as warriors, merchants, and priests, and not as tribes, the word Hellenes being derivable from Helios, the sun. If, then, Hellenes means children of the sun, there is another strong link between them and the true Hindus,

since both the warrior castes, the Rajpoots and the Bhattias of Cutch, claim to be "children of the sun."

Even among the Hebrews there appears the same tendency to form caste, as exemplified in the Levitical priesthood. The laws of Moses, however, transformed these wandering tribes into an agricultural race, of which every member had an inalienable ownership in the soil. Whatever was purchased had to be returned at the general jubilee; hence the temptation to buy or to sell was greatly diminished. This was an unique system, unknown to any other Aryan nation.

This tendency is not to be glanced at without consideration. It was one of the great distinctions between the Aryan and the Turan races. It was, in fact, the germ of stratification. The Turans were, above all things, a mob. Between the people and the despot there was no gradation. The people obeyed blindly and implicitly, with an unswerving self-negation abhorrent to self-respect, and smacking strongly of fetichism.* But the Aryan government had in it, at all times, something of the patriarchal idea, out of which it sprang. The king was not a god, he was a father. He was in *magna* what the chief of the pettiest tribe was in *parvo*. As the latter consulted his old men, so the former took counsel from the chiefs of the tribes. And the father of a family was as the chief of a tribe. Thus it was among the Jews, thus among the Kelts, among the Germans, among the Persians, among the Vedic Hindus, and, to this day, among the Arabs. These, as well as the Jews, have long been accepted as Semitic, but the community of ideas, institutions, weapons, and religious traditions has proved too strong for that error, and both Bunsen and Ernest Renan agree in separating them from the Semite.

The Brahmans, when once they became firmly established as a priesthood, gained for themselves extraordinary authority by the doctrines of metempsychosis and emanation. The former is the natural consequence of the latter, which teaches that there is nothing definite or actually existing, save in Brahm, (the essence,) and that all other things are

* A despot, in Greek, was called *τυραννος* id est, a Turan.

maya, or illusion. All things proceed from him, neither is there anything in the universe that is not from him and will not return to him. Those things which, by their nature, are inconsistent with the godhead, such as sin, pain, &c., are not really, but only seem to be, through *maya*, or illusion.*

The doctrine of metempsychosis is, that the divine spirit, emanating from Brahm, animates all living organisms, from men down to plants. The soul, quitting the body, wanders through an infinite series of existences, until, purified, it enters the body of a Brahman. There it is upon the threshold of beatitude, of which, according to one of the Purans, there are four; cohabitation, dwelling in the same place with the godhead; approximation, being permitted to draw near to his footstool; assimilation, becoming like unto him; absorption, highest of the beatitudes, being identified with the divine essence, as a drop of water returns to the mass of the mighty ocean.†

It is easy to observe the immense power such a doctrine must have given to the Brahmans, who were not slow to avail themselves of it. The Smriti, or Institutes of Manu, define clearly the rights and privileges of the priesthood, and, besides, embody a vast number of myths, cosmogonical and theogonical, which yet had for their main end the conforming and strengthening of the Brahminic power.

The division of caste is explained in this work, as arising from the creation of the world by Brahm. Vishnu, the preserving spirit, is represented as sleeping upon the serpent Shesha (eternity), that floats on the face of the waters; a lotus springs from his navel, whence issues Brahma, who produces the elements, forms the world, and gives birth to Shiva, the destroyer. He then produces the human race, the Brahmans from his head, the Kshatriyas, or warriors, from his arms, the Vaisyas, or merchants, from his thighs, and the Sudras, or laborers, from his feet.

But the inconsistency and chaotic condition of the Hindu records is nowhere better exemplified than in the accounts of the creation, of which there are many. In some Brahma is

* Col. Vans Kennedy, p. 24.

† Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. 3.

the creator, and gives birth to Vishnu ; in others Shiva is the sole self-existent being, and the creator of all things. In others, again, Brahm, the divine essence, produces Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, and gives the work of creation to the first, of sustaining it to the second, and of destroying it, in the fulness of time, to the third. But what is remarkably singular, is, that it is impossible to point out any time when Brahma, the creator, was ever publicly worshipped. From the adoration of Indra, in the Vedic period, we come at once upon the worship of Vishnu, in the Sanskrit, which is somewhat strange, since the worship of Indra was the *causa irarum, semperque doloris*, and the origin of the Aryan dispersion.

There is something singular in the ancient priesthoods of the Keltic races ; there is a misty resemblance to the Brahminic, which requires consideration. Nay, more, it has been shrewdly suspected that among the Greeks, Danaï, Argives, and Dorians are not to be taken as distinct tribes, but as castes of warriors, merchants, and priests. If so, it might prove, on a careful comparison of Keltic records, that the emigration, of that early race was simultaneous ; in short, that all the Aryan emigrations were simultaneous and *forced*, the emigrants being the heretics who refused to accord supremacy to Indra.

But that Indra should have been forgotten after the half of the Aryan people had been expelled Bactria on his account, seems extraordinary ; and can only be accounted for by the supposition that he was still worshipped under another name—that of Vishnu. For the word Indra seems only a title, lord of Ind, and may have been abandoned after the conquest of Pankyala, by the Aryans. This province seems to have been the Punjaub, the land of the five rivers, which was bounded on the south by the river Sutlej. Heeren, in his account of the rock temples of Ellora, speaks of Indra as the specific god of the Hindus, the "Lord of Ind," and Vishnu, conjointly with Shiva, as the gods of the universe. But though this distinction may have been understood at the remote time even, when the excavations of Ellora were in progress, it is evidently not original, but an

adaptation to circumstances. It is clear that in the purely Vedic times there was no worship of Shiva ; neither, indeed, was there of Vishnu. But the universal god of the Bactrians would seem to have been the true Deity, whose name, like the Hebrews, the Christians, and the Persians, they were unwilling to take in vain. When this pure belief had become, through the inevitable accumulations of years, encrusted with the worship of Agni, of Varuna, Indra, and others, the truth became dormant. But though the Word spake not, it influenced the religion and practices of the Aryans, which were everywhere mild, pure and full of grateful affection for divine protection. When, therefore, this universal godhead lay hidden in the breasts of the Brahmins, and the worship of Indra had become predominant, it still influenced the religion fast becoming depraved, and the rites of Indra were mild and pure. But this is essentially the characteristic of the adoration of Vishnu, in marked contrast to the atrocities of Sivaitic worship. We must suppose, then, that the Brahmans, conscious of their guilt in introducing the adoration of Shiva, attempted to represent the true God, the divine word ; and clothed him hitherto unseen, unmentioned, but ever felt, in the attributes and with the forms of Indra.

This hypothesis, which has but little authority to support it, is recommended, however, by a circumstance which has escaped the notice of mythologists. Vishnu is called universally Narayanah,* which means "God of the Aryans." It has been shown that Indra was particularly the god worshipped in the later Aryan period, and it certainly seems a natural consequence that the two, Vishnu and Indra, are one, or that Narayanah refers to the true God.

If Brahma never received popular worship, being essentially a deity of the records, and not of the temples, it is not so with Vishnu. Although in later times the worship of Shiva became predominant, and the adoration of Vishnu was considered old-fashioned, and hardly respectable for a Brahmin who desired to stand well in the community, yet his

* Col. Vans Kennedy's *Researches*.

worship has been perpetuated by his avatars, or incarnations, in various forms. Of these he informed his adorers that the full number would be ten, nine of them having elapsed, and the tenth being now anxiously expected by the faithful.

The first three were under animal forms; the first as a fish, when he informs a pious prince of an approaching deluge, in which the world would be submerged and its inhabitants drowned. He gives him instructions to build an ark, and to enter it with his family and couples of all living things, and to rely upon him for succor. The account is remarkably similar to that of Genesis, though tinged with a burlesque extravagance never found in the Hebrew sacred writings. The fourth incarnation was in the form of a dwarf, and the others under human form. But the seventh, eighth, and ninth are famous avatars; the seventh was Rama, the eighth Krishna, and the ninth Buddha.

Rama is a warrior god, and the battles which he fights are apparently against demons, and for the recovery of Swerga. It is, however, believed by Bunsen,* that these contests were not celestial, by any means, but an actual contest carried on in the Doab, or land of the two rivers, by princes who claimed to be descended from the sun; and that Rama was a leader who pretended to divine origin to increase his authority and the enthusiasm of his followers. But it is fair to say that Bunsen sees dynasties of kings under the most hopeless myths, and will not accept as gods any who cannot be traced to Phœnicia. It may be, as he suggests, that the Ramayana, in which the exploits of Rama are recorded, does really refer to such a contest. But there is one reason why some hesitation should be felt before accepting his theory; and that is, that Rama is only one in a series of avatars, and to explain away this would necessitate the explanation of all the others. But the distinguished mythologist, Max Müller,† has believed that the Ramayana is founded on the same subject as the Iliad, and that both refer to the expulsion of the opposers of the Brahminic caste and the dominant worship of Indra.

* *Place of Egypt in Universal History.*

† *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.*

The introduction of Hunaiman, the monkey god, and the army of monkeys mounted on bears, which charges the squadrons of elephants led on by the demons, seems, however, to require a different explanation from that offered by Sir William Jones. He considers it merely the luxuriant play of Hindu imagination; but it can scarcely be imagined that the presence of the monkey god in the Hindu Pantheon is due to the Ramayana. Had Hesiod and Homer never lived, the Greek mythology might have lost some poetical adornments, but not one solid fact. They invented nothing, but gave in glowing rhymes and with undying images the beliefs of their respective times. And so with the author of the Ramayana epic. Had Hunaiman held no place among the Hindu gods, we may be assured that he would not have fought side by side with Rama. The truth would seem to point to an alien origin. The Hindu gods are elemental, and can be traced to the theory of emanation. The Turan deities are astro-cosmic, changing into anthropomorphic; but animal worship, the belief that all animals, or any specific animals, had a god who cared for their interests and would severely punish any ill treatment of them, that belief is negro fetish, and altogether dissimilar from either Aryan or Turan.

This trace of negro religion in western India will be fully borne out by a consideration of the lower classes of the Malabar coast, of western Madras. Their hair is woolly, their features distinctly African, their brain of negro contour. Nor does this fact refer solely to the Madrassis. Among the islands of the eastern archipelago it recurs, until in Papua the resemblance is so marked that the discoverer called it "New Guinea."

The eighth avatar is that of Krishna. This incarnation is, perhaps, even more celebrated among the scholars of Europe than that of Rama, owing, probably to the luxuriant poetry which describes his feats of arms and his amours. He has been thought by Bunsen to be identical with Hercules, but his characteristics are all those of Apollo. Krishna first revealed his divine nature when, as a herdsman, he was keeping the cattle of Garga, a *prohita*, or officiating priest of Vishnu

His master invoked the holy name of Narayan, and Krishna ran to him with more than mortal benignity in his countenance.* There is evidently a strong point of connection with the Greek myth of their god Apollo, who kept the herds of King Admetus. This is still further strengthened by the characteristics of both deities, for it is not so much in the outward form and the mere symbols that we are to trace the connection of foreign mythologies. It is rather in the character and conduct of the deities. Thus Krishna, like Apollo, is the patron of poetry and music, and his amours with the pastoral muses, the Gopyas, is the theme of the famous poem, the *Gita-govinda*.

This poem bears a curious resemblance to the Song of Solomon, and the passion of Krishna for the amorous Radha bears, according to Brahmanical scholars, the same interpretation as the affection of the deity for the human soul. The general amours of Krishna with the Gopyas may also be understood as referring to the desire of the human intellect for those arts which soften the understanding and bind together, in sympathetic harmony, the masses of humanity. Everything which is too warmly colored, and is unchaste, is explained as *maya*, or illusion.

Krishna is known by many names, but more habitually by that of Heri, around which title much confusion clings. It appears to belong more especially to Shiva, and in the Naraduya Paran. Vishnu, speaking of the latter, says :

"But who can declare the greatness of him who assumes the form of the Lingam (phallus)? For that form represents both Hara and Hari; since there is no difference between them, and he who thinks there is commits a sin."

Shiva also, in another Paran,† says :

"Though I am the sole self-existent god, incorporeal, immutable, still do I assume various forms. Amongst the skilled in divine knowledge I am Brahma; amongst those exempt from *maya* I am that ancient god, Hari."

It must be confessed that this is puzzling. If it was not that Shiva proclaims himself as the sole self-existent deity,

* Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. 24, p. 216 to 250.

† Col. Vans Kennedy's *Researches*.

it might be imagined that Heri was Time, but Shiva, as Time, is *Kal*, a word never used in this Puran. The idea that Heri is identical with Homs, the Egyptian Apollo, or sun-god, has been scouted by Bunsen, who believes Hom to have been of Phœnician origin. Herodotus declared that he could see no identity between Homs and Phœbos Apollo. Pomey, in his *Pantheum Mythicum*, declares the identity of Krishna with the latter, but does not trouble himself about the word Heri. Perhaps the explanation may be found in the meaning of the word, for *hara*, in Sanskrit, has the meaning of agent, or doer. Thus, likewise, *hara* is a writer, or clerk; *bolnehara*, an orator. Heri would, therefore, have the meaning of active principle, and, as a title, would probably be synonymous with *hero*. It may be that the Greek word *heros* has the same derivation.

Formerly, in England, when a man was forcibly robbed on the highway, he raised the hue and cry in the following style: "Haro, hue and cry. Help, every true man. I am forcibly withheld from mine own." And in France and in the Channel Islands it was once the practice for the complainant to cry out in any public assembly: "Haro, haro, à mon aide, mon prince. Haro, on m'a fait tort." This has been explained as referring to a Norman prince, a Berserker, one Haro, but it is capable of receiving a very different explanation.

If a philologist were asked to explain the word *hue* he would at once admit that it was part of an old invocation to the Deity, "Allah hu," cry the Osmanlis of to-day as did their Turan forefathers. Ta-ho is the Chinese name for the Deity. Hari ho is the name by which Shiva is known in Thibet. In the sentence, "Ho, every one that thirsteth," *ho* would be classed as an interjection, yet its connection with hue is indisputable. There can be little doubt that it means "hear us," and that "Haro, hue and cry" is the forgotten relic of an old Pagan invocation, as truly as "O Baal, hear us," was an invocation for the Syrians.

How it came to be known in England is a question foreign to the subject. Yet, *en passant*, we may credit the Danes with it, seeing that Skandinavia, their country, gets its name from

Skanda, one of the names of Shiva. But with reference to Krishna, we must believe that Heri is applied to him in a complimentary way by the poets, in the signification of celestial hero, and that it has no connection with "the ancient god Heri," mentioned in the Kurana Puran.

The ninth avatar is that of Buddha, which took place apparently in modern time—that is, for mythology. His appearance has been fixed at varying dates, but the average is about nine hundred and fifty years before the Christian era. The Buddhists, however, claim a far higher antiquity than that awarded by the Brahminical books, and say that Buddha is older than any Brahman deity. They maintain that the Brahmans came from other countries, and established their own religion mainly by the power of the sword on the ruins of the more ancient one of Buddha.* Heeren has remarked that the most finished rock temples of India are dedicated as well to the worship of Vishnu and Shiva as to that of Buddha; the sects of the former still existing, but the latter were expelled from Western India.† In the famous grotto of Elephanta a figure of Buddha is represented with a woolly head. He is seated in his usual cross-legged style, and between his legs is the fore part of a ship filled with strangers.‡ In Salsette, in a pagoda, there is another image of Buddha. He has there long ears, woolly hair, and the inevitable ship in his lap.

Now the grottoes of Ellora are of red granite. In fact the whole mountain range extending in a horse shoe form for five miles from point to point, has been cut into a series of grotto temples, two or three stories in height, one above the other. These are all dedicated to various gods. The largest is called Kailasa, the heaven of Shiva.

In Karli and some other rock temples, the material is of a clay porphyry, the very hardest, most enduring kind of stone. Yet many of the sculptured representations have been so acted upon by the atmosphere that they can with difficulty be recognized.§ Yet here again images of Buddha are found. This would seem to substantiate the Buddhistic claims.

* Coleman's *Hindoo Mythology*, p. 184.

† *Asiatic Researches*, vol. 3, p. 67.

‡ Coleman's *Mythology*.

§ Stobæus *Ecl. Phys.*

The Buddhist faith imputes creation to chance, and denies the existence of a Supreme Being. Virtue and goodness are their objects of worship, and these are adored under the forms of pious and learned sages, who have progressed according to the theory, to a condition of beatific rest. The doctrine of metempsychosis is firmly held, and to a degree that seems absurd. Hospitals are erected for the reception of animals, reptiles, insects, even the most loathsome and annoying, and these are daily fed with care by the attendants. So great is the Buddhist fear of destroying animal life, that he lives only on flour, butter, cheese, fruits and sweetmeats, and it is recorded that a pious Jaina, to whom a mischievous Englishman showed a drop of water under the microscope, voluntarily starved himself, refusing both food and water.

How such a faith became connected with Vishnu is something which the Brahmans find it difficult to explain. The rather lame hypothesis has been started that Vishnu became Buddha, to lead two heretical sects into a heresy that would ensure their damnation. But the proofs in favor of the higher antiquity of Buddha are too strong to be controverted. From the denial of a Supreme Being, from the care of animals, from the deification of man, from the woolly head of the figures of the deity, and his distinctly African features, we draw the conclusion that Buddha, under perhaps some other name, was the original man god of African fetichism, even as Hunaiman is the monkey god.

The grotto temples of Ellora honor alike Vishnu and Shiva. Historians of mild analytic powers have believed that there was a time when Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva received equal adoration.* It is true that in the Purans the equality between the two latter is strictly enforced, and the pains of hell are promised to whoever shall deny this. Thus in the "Padma Puran" Shiva says:

"He who thus worships Vishnu, in fact worships me, and whoever thinks otherwise shall be condemned to hell; for Vishnu Shiva, Shiva Vishnu are but one form, though existing separately."

Nothing is here said about Brahma, and it may fairly be

* Col. Kennedy's *Researches*, p. 185.

doubted if Brahma was ever worshipped at all. Hence the theory of the Trimurti, or Hindu trinity, fell to the ground. But it may also be questioned if Vishnu was not at one time the paramount deity of India, his worship being supplanted by Shiva. Their temples are, indeed, side by side at Ellora, and the heavens of Kailasa and Vaikuntha are equally represented. But Shiva is even there everywhere predominant, with his consort Bahvani. The fact that these extraordinary structures are only to be found in western India, whereas the Brahmans clearly came from the north, should demonstrate to every one that the religions of Shiva and Vishnu were not one but twain. In fact Shiva ought to be looked upon as an interloper, as a poison that crept into the veins of Hindu mythology, and destroyed it.

Schlegel has remarked, that at a very early period the Hindu language suffered considerable foreign admixture from the various tribes that dwelt in the south and west (the Carnatic and the Mahratta country), and who became incorporated with the body of the nation.* These tribes were Turan, who are spoken of by many authors as Cushites, and their religion, similar to the general belief of the Turans, spread over Asia, Africa, and Europe. If Shiva is god of those tribes of whom Schlegel made mention, then his worship would be found identical with Turan worship elsewhere.

This view, which all must admit is reasonable, is singularly easy of proof. The earliest faith of the Turan nations was a belief in two active principles, male and female, from whose union all things proceeded. In the Hebrew the verse, "And the earth was without form and void,"† should have been translated, "And the earth was *tohu bohu*." Now these words, according to Bunsen, were the earliest names of the male and female principles. *Hu* being admitted to be an invocation, the monosyllables *to* and *bo* remain. It must be noted that all early forms of language are of one syllable, and if others are found, they are not genuine, but belong to a later age. This is plain from the very nature of the growth of language. Now *to* is still found in the Chinese, and *bo* survives in India, as Bohwani, the bride of Shiva, accepted

* *Literature and Wisdom of the Hindus.*

† *Genesis*, c. i., v. 2.

by all writers as the personification of the producing power of nature. The idea involved is simply the birth of all things from chaotic conditions; and, indeed, in its highest sense, may be taken to define, in a clumsy manner, the chemical theory of affinity. But for the mass it only meant a great male god and a great female goddess, whose symbols were the *lingam* and the *yoni* (the phallos and ithiphallos), and who were visibly represented under the forms of a bull and cow, probably the strongest and most fruitful animals known to those fierce and cruel nomads.

Whether the bloody human sacrifices which distinguish this worship arose from the sanguinary disposition of the Turans, or from a perception that in all births there is the germ of death, and that the Lord of life is also the Lord of death, is hard to determine. But it is probable that the sacrifices came first from the Turan habit of slaying their captives, and the philosophy came afterwards from the Aryans, who adopted it from their neighbors, to excuse or to explain it.

At what time this simple faith of the primal generative powers became blended with astral worship is also lost in the mist of ages. The Turan warrior shepherds guarding their flocks by night, as they gazed over the vast plains of central Asia, watched with wondering, awe struck eyes the panorama of the heavens, and the solemn sweep of the stars around the pole. Hence arose the notion that the heaven of Shiva was situated there. Little by little, after generations of awed watchers, the belief stole into the hearts of these bearded warriors that the stars were gods whose tireless eyes watched over the destinies of the human race. And so the constellations were named. Chief among them was that of the Bull, or Taurus, by which they symbolized To. Hence their cosmic god, though the name To was lost, was always known as the bull. Thus Baal is frequently called Baal Tor; and thus the chief god of the northern nations is Thor, and Zeus was invoked as *αἰετταυρος*,* "*worthy bull*." Amun, the Egyptian cosmic god, was worshipped under the visible form of a bull,

* Bunsen, *Place of Egypt in Universal History*, book 5.

who afterward was considered as a separate god Apis. And Shiva has for his *vahan* the sacred bull.*

In the Sivaitic mythology, which preserved far greater unity than any other from its slighter admixture with star worship, we find names almost as ancient as those quoted—those of Hara, Hari, and Hari Gauri. Of Hari mention has already been made, but Gauri has indubitable reference to a cow. Hari Gauri is explained by the Brahminical writers as Shiva and Bohwani—that is the cosmic bull and cow—To and Bo. Now the earth, in one of the Purans, appears before Vishnu in the form of a cow. The Sanskrit word for cow is *gau*. We, therefore, may explain Hari Gauri as the generative influence of the sun upon the fertile earth. We have already remarked that in Hesiod there is a myth of Ouranos and Gaia, in which Ouranos devours the offspring of their union as fast as they are produced, till Kronos, a child reared in secrecy, mutilates his father, and prevents his begetting further offspring. Bunsen and others have clearly shown the meaning to be that in chaos there were many creations which disappeared until the last Kronos or definite time, when the creative power was either destroyed or became dormant. Here the earth is called *gaia*, and the connection between the Hesiodic myth and the Sivaitic fables may be considered indubitable. Also in the Phœnician mythology Hastoreth (Astarte) means “the throne of the cow.”† Isis, among the Egyptians, is always represented with a head-dress of cows’ horns and a globe between them, symbolizing clearly the earth.

But it is not alone in mere nomenclature, or even in external symbolism, that this connection of the Greek with the Turanian part of the Hindu religion, will be found. The worship of Zeus was accompanied with human sacrifices, and cruel rites, such as gashing the body of the votary with knives, and the sacrifice of strangers. Hence he is ironically called “the hospitable,” and the friend of hospitality; and it must be repeated that Zeus is also triopthalmos, having an eye in his forehead like the horrible Shiva. This has

* Coleman, p. 86.

† Bunsen, *Place of Egypt*, book 4.

been forgotten by those who have believed that Jupiter and Zeus are one. Jupiter is paternal, grave and solemn, bearing in his right hand the lightning, and drinking out of the celestial cup. So Indra, the Bactrian god, is depicted, and in the Vedas repeated mention is made of his quaffing the celestial *soma*.^{*} Jupiter descends to no low amours. Zeus is constantly engaged, like Shiva, in intrigue, and perpetually quarrelling with Bohwani, as Zeus with Hera. Jupiter's rites are solemn and pure. Zeus is not only adored with bloody sacrifice, but with public prostitution, as is Shiva. And, further, Zeus, like Amun, is worshipped between the pillars, the Sivaitic emblem of the lingam. That there was a material taint of Turanism, even in the Latins, was inevitable from their neighborhood to the Etruscans, a mixed race of Turans and Aryans, of Phœnician extraction. This will be seen in their female deities, a thing unknown to the Aryans, who, having been blessed with a divine revelation, never did nor could associate ideas of sex with their deities. It was altogether from Turan sources that the principle of the Shaktis, or female energies of the gods, crept into the Hindu mythology, and those derived from it. In the Puran's Saraswati the bride of Brahma is the patroness of the arts and learning, but is altogether an abstraction, taking no part in the divine history. The name, also, is derived from the ancient name of the Jumna. Lakshmi, the energy of Vishnu, is the goddess of love and beauty, and is, in every attribute, similar to Aphrodite. All the others, and there are thousands, in a theology which numbers thirty-three millions of deities may easily be reduced down to Bohwani, the consort of Shiva, and the Turan *Bo*. Schlegel† has hazarded the conjecture that the Phœnician Hastoreth, the Phrygian Cybele, the Ephesian Artemis, and the German Hertha only differ in unessential points from this sanguinary goddess. Her picture is by no means a pleasing one. She is represented as having four arms, with which she brandishes weapons of destruction, and a human head. She wears a chain of human heads, alternately black

^{*} Drink extracted from the moon.

[†] *Literature and Wisdom of the Hindus.*

and white, that reaches from her neck to her thighs, and around her waist is a cincture of gory human hands. It must be admitted that the nations above quoted worshipped her under more agreeable forms.*

Coleman and Vans Kennedy both state that there is a sect in India which worships exclusively these Shaktis, but they are in error. That they are adored secretly and in the most bestial manner there is no doubt, but it is by men of every caste and every sect, and is an orgie which words cannot describe. Every law of Manu is, for the time, abrogated. Every one, Brahmans included, eats meat, and drinks strong liquor from the same cup. And, when the festival is concluded, the votaries return home, but never recognize each other publicly or otherwise. It is very possible that the secret worship of Cybele was of a similar character.

As Schlegel has pointed out the identity of Artemis and Bohwani, it may be well to inquire how this goddess came to be associated with the moon. It probably arose from a misconception of the cow's horns of Isis, which the Ephesians believed to be a crescent moon, not knowing the mystic meaning of the emblem. For as Chanda the moon, in the Hindu theogony, is a male, it is obvious that there has been some misconception.

Of the many children of Shiva and Bohwani, few are worthy of note save Ganesha and Iswara, though the latter seems most frequently considered as Shiva himself. Ganesha, now known as Ganapati, has a special sect of his own, and is represented in his temples with the head of an elephant. He is the god of the human intellect, and is distinguished in the Hindu mythology by what a Yankee would term cuteness. Sir William Jones considered him to be identical with Janus, as also did Pomey in his *Pantheum Mythicum*. We know so little of the Roman god that it is hard to decide upon the correctness of the hypothesis. Ganapati, as special god of humanity, certainly seems to have the same bearing as Buddha towards fetichism. But there is a slight difference between

* Hekate may also be taken for Bohwani, who, in her combat with Bali, the Hindu Typhon, assumes a gigantic figure with a hundred arms. And Briareus may have a similar origin.

the man-god and the deity who cares specially for the human intellect. It is very slight, doubtless, yet from the seeming identity of this god with the Tartar deity Hams, and with the Babylonish Oannes, it would seem that he is distinctly Turan, and, therefore, Jan, or Janus may be one and the same with Ganesha. Niebuhr has pointed out that the two heads of the Roman deity were given him so that he might survey with equal eye the welfare of the Rharnes and the Quirites, between whose towns his temple was built. And he thinks further, that this deity belonged to the Sabines, who were Gaels. As the Gaels were Aryans, and Ganesha is Turanic, he must have been adopted by the Kelts and Germans from the Turanic element which they dispossessed in Europe.

Iswara, whether son of Shiva, or Shiva himself, is universally recognized as Bacchus. It is strange that a nation who have from the remotest historic times, abjured the use of liquor, should have in their Pantheon the prototype of the jolly conquering god Bacchus. But there is no doubt of it, for the universal testimony of the ancients is, that Bacchus came from India, bringing the care-destroying cup. There is a goddess who presides over drinking; but this is easily explained, as at the worship of the Shaktis, intoxication is a solemn act of religion. The command is "drink, drink till you fall on the ground, then rise up and drink again." But Iswara takes no part in these rites, nor is he a distinguished deity among the Hindus, though Shiva frequently speaks of himself as Iswara. The worship of Bacchus, or, rather, drinking, was not a vice of the Turans, for the simple reason that they for a long time were unacquainted with the secret of fermentation. At present they manage to make a drink from a mushroom, and also from milk. Marco Polo and Friar Rubriques, both mention, though not approvingly, the fermented mare's milk at the Khan's table. Probably in Xanadu a better beverage is used. From these facts, we must doubt the Turanic origin of Iswara, and rather believe that when the western Hindus, that is, the Turans, became acquainted with wine, they immediately added Iswara to the family of Shiva. But wine, as almost every art and invention, will be traced to an Aryan brain.

In the Hindu mythology we find clearly the traces of that older, purer faith which was the special characteristic of the Aryans, but disfigured by the Turan worship of Shiva. The resemblance, therefore, of the Hellenic and cognate races, is due to two things; first, to their Aryan ancestry, from which they derive the idea of Apollo, or the sun god, as distinct from the Turan worship of the sun itself; and, secondly, to the same influence that corrupted the Hindu ethics and religion. This latter resemblance does not necessitate actual communication between the Hellenes and Pelasgi on the one hand, and the Hindus on the other; for history teaches us that no such after communication took place. But having a fundamental common fund of traditions, originally, as we may believe, derived from divine revelation, and being acted upon by the same disturbing element, analogous results followed. Thus, though the worship of Zeus and of Shiva are identic, and the two gods are doubtless one, we must not conclude that the Greeks learned it from the Hindus, but both acquired it from the same bad source—the Turans. Jupiter, however, who, we hold, is synonymous with Indra, was a belief which the Pelasgians inherited from their ancestors, who once lived in Ariana, or Bactria.

Unfortunately for the cause of history, nomenclature has too strong a hold upon the human mind. Accustomed to regard the Turans as the enemies of Iran, writers have failed to perceive that the Khamites are the same people. The word Mongol has also been a fruitful source of error, since it has acquired a meaning calculated to lead astray. The term has been given to the wandering Tartars of central Asia, and accordingly writers even as great as Miczewicz speak of races as mongol which are distinctly Aryan. The fact is, that there are Aryan nomads as well as Mongol, if Mongol is to be used to designate Khamites. The golden horde which exists to this day is Aryan; the Cossacks of the Don, and many of the tribes called Uralian, are of the same stock. Yet most unfortunately the word is taken universally as Khamitic. This will account for the strange fact that almost all writers, save Bunsen, have failed to recognize that Europe was peopled by Turans before the Aryan

dispersion. This was the race of unbelievers whom the Hebrews, most distinctly an Aryan nation, were commanded to root out. The Zend-avesta, and the ancient songs of the Irans, bear witness that they conceived they had the same injunction; and from scattered hints, we may conjecture that the Hindus believed they had received the same mission.

The misfortunes that befell the Hebrews was the inevitable result of disobedience. The sons of God (Aryans) intermarried with the daughters of men (Turan), and begat a race of giants. So runs the word of revelation; and the mixed race was indeed one of extraordinary development. The Phœnician, the Etruscan and the Egyptian, must be numbered among the nations of this admixture; also, in all probability, the Arab and the Syrian. All of these tyrannized over the Aryan people, in some instances destroying them; in others, retarding their increase and stunting their intellectual development. So particularly with the Hindus, whose union with the Turans of the west culminated in a condition of moral wretchedness, to which the wide earth yields no parallel.

But to ascribe to the Hindus proper the horrible bestial worship which for a long time characterized their religion, would be to ignore all their sacred works, more especially the earlier. Though man is prone to degenerate, it is not within the bounds of possibility that a nation once blessed with divine inspiration, could descend so low as this people, unless under some strong influence from the outside. The same argument would lead us to believe that the Almighty did not, in his infinite wisdom, consider the Turans fit to receive a revelation of the truth. They were abandoned to their own devices, and the result was—Shiva and Bohvani. To this delightful pair belongs everything that could raise a blush or excite horror in humanity. The amiable sect of the Thugs adored Bohvani, and strangled their victims to do her pleasure. The Japanese practice of *hari-kari*, is simply an offering of one's own body to Hari and Gauri; that is, Shiva and Bohvani. The rites of Juggernaut, the immolation of captives under the ear; the whirling of human beings on the hooks; the burning of widows; all these things were choice oblations and adoration

for this terrible couple. Blood and lust were the principles of the religion. Let us ask ourselves if the same faith could have produced the noble sentences which indicate the nature of Brahm?

ART. II.—1. *Galerie des contemporaines illustres.* DE LOMÉNIE. Paris.

2. *Portraits littéraires.* PAR CHARLES-AUG. SAINTE-BEUVE.

3. *Histoire de Port-Royal.* ST. BEUVE.

4. *Vie, Poésies et Pensées de Joseph Delorme.* ST. BEUVE.

5. *Galerie des Gens de Lettres au Dix-neuvième siècle.* CH. ROBIN.

6. *Nouveaux Portraits littéraires.* GUSTAVE PLANCHE.

7. *Ouvrages complètes de VICTOR HUGO.* PARIS.

Madame de Girardin, daughter of the accomplished Sophie Gay, and spouse deceased of the present editor of the *Liberté* newspaper of Paris, invented, in years gone by, a cruel simile touching the breaking of the bond of friendship between Victor Hugo and Sainte-Beuve, when both were at the threshold of their literary lives. "*Sainte-Beuve était un poète on Victor Hugo mettait du bois,*" said the sarcastic authoress of "*Le Vicomte de Launay,*" and added, with the accent of doom forecast: "*Victor Hugo n'en met plus.*" Although she did not live to witness the serene triumph of Sainte-Beuve's later years, Madame de Girardin realised before she died the failure of her implied prediction; for the reputation of him who was one day to write the "*Causeries de Lundi,*" continued to develop itself after his separation from Hugo, and at the time of his demise he was regarded as the foremost of that renowned and cultivated craft, the literary critics of France.

Charles Auguste Sainte-Beuve was born, and for the first fourteen years of his life resided, in Boulogne, that old, ugly, Anglo-French town; that cheery haven which so many sea-worn travellers to the Continent have reached with rapturous relief, to leave it behind them in their flight toward Paris, with, quite possibly, that same unconcerned delight in which Sainte-Beuve quitted it half a century ago. He never re-

visited his native place, which does not appear to have been for him an over-hallowed spot, nor one of rosy reminiscences. Boulogne meant his infancy, and his infancy meant poverty in a dreary sea-side city, where he was reared by his mother and aunt, who were English calvinists; his father, a government clerk on a moderate salary, having died while the future critic was yet unborn. Educated with all the rigor of calvinistic principles, the child-fanatic, who sometimes rose in the night to iterate his prayers, nevertheless became the sceptic who, in 1868, so eloquently and sturdily defended Renan and his works. The young puritan was promptly made acquainted with some of the English poets, for whom he evinced a great fondness, particularly Wordsworth and Crabbe, and he terminated his ancient classics, carrying off prizes for Latin verse, at the Bourbon and Charlemagne colleges. Upon leaving college he walked the Paris hospitals, and studied medicine, which first unsettled the religious teaching received at maternal hands, and his subsequent reading of the encyclopedists undermined it more completely. Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Condillac, and others, were his favorite masters, and while yet but a youth, his enthusiasm for them, and the calling of *un homme de lettres*, was such that he cast aside the surgeon's knife for the gray goose-quill of the journalist, in which capacity he commenced his remarkable career on the Paris "Globe."

Victor Hugo had already written the "Odes et Ballades," and if not then the lyric king that he was ecstasically styled by his admirers of a later era, he had acquired a lustre and a repute which placed him at the head of a literary clique, consisting of Barthélemy, Méry, Alf de Musset, de Vigny, and others, who called themselves the *romanesques*, and who, in 1823-6, made vigorous war upon the *classiques*, for the empire of lettered France. Forced to elect, Sainte-Beuve decided for the latter, and his onslaught upon the "Odes et Ballades" is recited to this day by those envious of Hugo, whilst it procured for its author, at the time, the advances of the poet, glad to welcome so clever an adversary to his house, and the celebrated *réunions intimes de la rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs*. During his intimacy with Hugo, and his school,

Sainte-Beuve published (1828) his "Tableau de la Poésie Française du Seizième Siècle," which was undertaken with a view to compete for the prize offered by the French Academy for a work on that subject. His original design grew into a larger plan, and the term set for the prize was passed, but France gained thereby a much more elaborate treatise. In 1829 the "Poésies et vie de Joseph Delorme" made its appearance, being an autobiography purporting to have been written by a medical student, who had died of consumption. The eccentricity and exaggeration of the phrase, and the *motif* of this latter publication, excited equivocal remark, if not downright disesteem. In the autobiography Sainte-Beuve adverts to the indications in himself of the germs of the very disease of which he died forty years later, and foreshadows coolly his own fate. "Les Consolations" (verse), which came out in 1830, were pretty much of the extravagant complexion of the "Poésies Delorme," but served to keep the neophyte before the public, as did his quarrel with Victor Hugo, which took place about this time. More or less scandal was mixed up with the account of the sudden estrangement, the truth of which has, in reality, never been known. But he of "the eagle's eye and the heart of the hare," as Cousin, innocently enough, once described his friend, quitted the sanctuary of Hugo and the *romanesques*, of which up to this time he had been an assiduous frequenter, never to put foot there again; and denying from that moment his whilom gods, he pointed a series of newspaper articles, disdainful and irreverent, for them and their temples.

Whatever the cause, the bad blood in the hearts of both Hugo and Sainte-Beuve lasted bitter to the end. At the public ceremony of induction to the chair, at the French Academy, so thronged by the literary and fashionable worlds of Paris, by a singular fortune, in 1845, it was upon Victor Hugo that the duty fell of replying to the admission speech of the honored and now radiant Sainte-Beuve; and, as was and is the complimentary custom, in that reply, to review with genial nicety and more or less emotion, the chief efforts of the freshman which had won him academical distinction. Hugo's

chance and memory, upon this occasion, were only too good. In his florid and impressive style he spoke at length of almost everything and everybody, yet managed, blandly but utterly, to ignore the literary labors of the *recipiendaire*, the frown and flutter of his dismayed friends who were come to hear him complimented, down even to the diminished presence and clouded aureola of the ireful new member.

It was in reference to this severance, and Saint-Beuve's manifestoes of hostility, above alluded to, that Madame de Girardin spoke the words quoted at the commencement of this paper; and though pestered and exasperated by the continued ridicule and rebuke of members of the Hugo set, among whom such adepts as Alphonse Karr were not the least pertinacious, Sainte-Beuve continued, and with great distinction, his avocation in the "*Revue de Paris*," and the scholarly and brilliant "*Revue des Deux Mondes*."

In 1830 he contributed to the "*National*" newspaper, and shortly after was an intimate friend of Lammenais, under the influence of which profound but mystical thinker, he published, when not far from thirty, his novel, "*Volupté*," a wild and crude, if clever painting, of the spiritual experience of Lacordaire.

Notwithstanding that he had been one of the most earnest of the staff of the Democratic "*National*" at a previous epoch, M. Sainte-Beuve deprecated the events of 1848, in which the *soi disant* protector of his youth, Victor Hugo, glorified; yet, like that protector, he became reconciled to the revolution and the presidency of Louis Napoleon, and, in all sober conscience, clung to Napoleon III. and the empire, which Hugo, outwitted and disgusted, has so irrationally and obstinately assailed. Capricious and vacillating, Sainte-Beuve had undoubtedly proved himself to be, yet, as the other has never claimed to be celestial, otherwise than in a lyrical way, how one-sided a pretext, if it be the reason why, ever since their rupture and the days of the *salon rue Notre-Dame des Champs*, Hugo's steady and dazzling literary fame has been persistently put forward to dwarf, by contrast, that more modest but most estimable field of letters, in which Sainte-Beuve served and shone. Be it that, however, or the critic's relative

failure as a poet—let the reason be what it may—the fact of this perpetual confrontation is notorious; hence the junction of these two names at the heading of this article, and hence, of necessity, a few cursory remarks upon Sainte-Beuve's great contemporary, the author of the "Chatiments" and the "Misérables."

The other is senior by only about two years, but more precocious. Hugo's prestige as a poet is of earlier date, and the Academy of Toulouse crowned him for his "Moïse sur le Nil," in 1820, when he was but eighteen. His massive reputation of to-day, however, is not a universal one, far-reaching though it be. Let those of his extollers, old or new, who—unable to topple the eminent French critic from his pedestal— inveighed against the religious, the political, and the literary turpitudes of the writer of "Volupté," seemed to rely upon a general belief in the infallibility of their great republican model, the voluntary exile of Guernsey. For all that, the immortal sonneteer is anything but free from political blemish, if flawless and resplendent otherwise.

"L'Événement" newspaper, which made its first appearance on the 31st of July, 1848, was known from the start as the Hugo paper, and to have been created to sustain Victor Hugo, in a possible contingency, as head of the state. If not an out-and-out Orleanist at its birth, it was, at all events, devoted to the election of Orleanist candidates for the chamber. Proudhon, the socialist, was contemned in its columns as "a miserable advocate of the people," which possibly might have been owing to the fact that the quaint philosopher, who admired Boileau, was no rhapsodist for Victor Hugo.* The last-named had sung, the year before, in bewitching verse his adulation of Charles X., and, after the fall of Louis Phillipe, the "Événement" became a beacon light for the mob, and, eventually, a supporter of Louis Napoleon† for the presidency, and waged doughty war for Bonapartism. In its

* Proudhon declared that a Rhine boatman, whom he heard rhyming and whistling at his work, improvised Hugo's *Orientales*.

† The introduction of its new conviction in the *Événement* has the true Hugo ring: "*La gloire de son nom est une lettre de change qu'il faut qu'il acquitte. M. Cavaignac (an opponent), lui c'est un inconnu. M. Louis Bonaparte, on sait par on le prendre; on peut le saisir par son nom et le manier!*"

leaders, perhaps from the very pen of the author of "Napoleon le Petit," was boundless praise lavished upon the prince, declared to be "the choice of God and the choice of the people;" "a Caesar destined to make France the queen of nations!" Only when it came to light that Louis Napoleon, chosen, had a native will which Louis Napoleon yet to be voted for, had suppressed, and that he would prove no puppet for Victor Hugo to manipulate, did the latter wheel about and compose that wretched calumny which lies between the covers of "Napoleon le Petit."

Of late years, Victor Hugo has been regarded by frenzied disciples as the paragon republican of ancient and modern history. "The black bread of liberty we prefer," he says, "to the white bread of servitude," an exclamation worthy of the time of Leonidas. But M. Hugo can have but about that appreciation of the black bread of liberty which a blind man has of colors, since he has never known want, nor been otherwise than pecuniarily successful in his business with his publishers. His father, a general, made a count by his king, lived until the son was twenty-six, and before the latter was thirty he was accorded a pension of fifteen hundred francs—equivalent to six hundred dollars of the present day—for his volume of *Odes et Ballades*; and Charles X., at the author's personal solicitation, when about to marry, granted the poet a further annuity of fifteen hundred francs, no part of which did he ever look upon, so far as known by the imperial treasury clerks, as the repellant bread of servitude. The "Rappel" newspaper, originated in Paris under the recent law, which grants even license to the turbulent Gallic press, is the old "Événement" revived, with the same editorial staff, the two Hugo sons, Charles and François Victor—who, with all the Hugo ebullition, have not a grain of their father's genius—a M. Vacquerie, and others. It signalizes itself among the journals of the capital by its gross personal attacks upon the emperor and his family, whilst it is boisterously red in its socialist proclivities. In case of a revolution, it stands ready to support Victor Hugo's claims to the presidency, short of which his partisans would not dare to proffer him; for the author of *Les Misérables* is a declared and aspiring party chief.

M. Sainte-Beuve was never a politician, in the sense in which his overshadowing coeval has been and is. The senate was the goal of the critic's political ambition, and his political claims lay in a temperate but unswerving devotion to Louis Napoleon, at a critical moment, and in his contributions, expounding imperial policy, which long held place in the "Moniteur," then the official journal of the empire. Nor was his devotion without sacrifice to himself; friends and connections he forsook in numbers when, in 1852, he came out as a champion of the new order of things. And few of the political writers of that eventful period, opposed to imperialism, who have not been probed and nettled by his caustic pen, though his fealty was not only never bought, but, to the last, was poorly requited by the government he served.

In 1853, he was appointed to inaugurate, at the college of France, the course of Latin poetry, which had been suspended years before. His favorite Virgil would, naturally, have formed a large feature in this labor, which was one of love as well as of honor and profit to him. But those modern Gracchi, those insatiable patriots, the students, had, as was afterwards demonstrated, something in their heads more pugnacious and aggressive than eclogues and bucolics. In M. Sainte-Bauve, as he then appeared, they pretended to see only the apostate of 1848—he whom they no longer loved—he, who with Armend Carrel, had been "to the foot of the Guillotine, to collect there the last words and testaments of the republican fathers," and who, nevertheless, had suffered himself to be decorated with a cross of the emperor's order, and on the *fête* day of Napoleon! The crowd was great, and when M. Sainte-Beuve, accompanied by M. Ampère, showed himself upon the platform, a storm of cries and whistlings of the most ominous description greeted them, during which the newly-made professor gravely unrolled his manuscript. He commenced reading, but the noise redoubled, and was now varied with choruses from the street songs then in vogue, and, as he persisted, finally the seats were torn from the floor and the doors were unhinged, with a menacing crash. "You dishonor the repu-

tation of the youth of France," cried the indignant lecturer. "It is you who have dishonored the literature of France by your political conduct," vociferated the republican students. "You have insulted me, and I withdraw," rejoined Sainte-Beuve, mortified and astounded. "Which is precisely what we demand," was shouted in answer, and, in spite of the protestations of M. Ampère and others present, the grieved, and now unpopular professor abandoned his place, and relinquished at once what had been a coveted charge.

Four years later, however, he accepted the post of *maître des conférences* at the normal school, where he was much liked and respected. Tardily, but finally, his bidding to Compiègne reached him; he went there, and quitted the emperor with joy in his heart, and the promise of his coming elevation, which made him senator in 1865. For nearly twelve years had he waited for this elevation, to which so many ordinary intellects have attained, sometimes almost without delay or effort. He was raised to it when it had become impossible to ignore his superior ability and augmented claims, and when it would have been shameful to refuse him. For this took place only when he was relatively wasted by a protracted and arduous life of unceasing occupation, and when, from sheer exhaustion, he was no longer at his apogee. The senate reached, and Sainte-Beuve's political ambition was compassed—once there, and his life, if still busied, was a perfect peace.

Of all the *proscrits* of 1851; of all the notable opponents to Napoleon III. and his dynasty, whether legitimist, Orleanist, democrat, or *rouge*, no one, for a decade back, has made himself more conspicuous than the self banished bard at Guernsey. Necessarily his publications have contributed to that effect, and he meant they should; but his pompous letters and political communications, his flourished refusal to accept the emperor's amnesty for political offences, his receptions and vaunted asylum to mouthing tacticians who got scared away from home, his advertised charities, and the endless mutterings or warnings of the sage of Guernsey—in a word, his vast and constant attitudinizing has made of him one of the most consequential, if not the most dangerous, of the sworn and banded foes of the Bonaparte régime. Of a

certain political church he is the god; and, inviolable as the kaiser or the pope, his followers bow to his fiat with shaking knees. His edicts are promulgated in superb language, it is true—brief, metallic, and oracular. One which was printed in the “*Rappel*” of the 15th October last, is a fair example. It related to an intended meeting, eleven days later, to protest against the non-convocation of the chamber, by the government—which protest would have been an incipient but unwise revolution. Abbreviated, it reads thus:

“Personne, le 26 Octobre, ne doit descendre dans la rue. . . . Que le peuple s’abstienne et le chassepot est paralysé, etc., etc. Tel est mon conseil. . . . Un dernier mot: le jour ou je conseillerai une insurrection j’y serai. Mais cette fois je ne la conseille pas.—*Hugo*.”

His inconsistency may have been the cause which raised up doubters in the same sincerity as Victor Hugo, when they came to view his professions in the past by the light of some of his acts. A flatterer of royalty when his personal ends were gained, and Louis Napoleon’s old and fond confederate, what wonder that not a few are skeptical of his thirsty democracy or his sonorous invective against the Bonapartes of the present day? What a reflection upon his sagacity, in the minds of many, even of his republican friends, must have been his ostentatious patronage of a person like Rochefort! A revolutionary scribbler whose calibre was measured by a squib; whose political theory sacrificed all principles to success, and who inspired a precious band, in which, unfortunately, are many like him—men avowedly as unscrupulous as the editor of the scurrilous and extinguished “*Lanterne*.” Samples are they of that wild agrarian stamp which surges in demoniac masses from the depths of the earth, at the first tocsin of a Paris insurrection, and whose chiefs M. Griérout of the “*Opinion Nationale*,” and himself a democrat, denounces as “*valliguere*,” “scourges of democracy,” and “would-be apers of Danton and Robespierre.”* Such

* “There is nothing more unlike 1793 than 1869,” are the words of the “*Opinion Nationale*.” “The business of that epoch was to overthrow the feudal and catholic world; the work of the present day is to reconstruct . . . and those who wish to ascertain the relative measures of the two undertakings, have only to compare the great destroyers of those days with their imitators of the present: Mirabeau and Danton—Rochefort and Vacquerre!” (one of the editors of the *Rappel*.)

is the party which the lion of Guernsey aims to lead, thereby exposing the weak punctilio of a selfish and thwarted ambition* in the choice of means to aid it. The brotherhood was in great number at the congress of Lausanne last September, where met in conclave the fire-brands of Europe, mostly of the socialist persuasion, and fitly selected Victor Hugo as their president. With childish gravity he urged his idea of a European United States — with Hugo chief magistrate, of course — an idea born of his soaring genius and his inflated nonsense. On the other hand, the unblushing parsimony of the august hero of Guernsey, as concerns the solid fruits of his intellect — which was so publicly shown up and condemned at the announcement of *l'Homme qui rit*; and the exorbitant price charged by the publishers, following the directions of the author — has given rise to a speculation as malicious as plausible, touching the fiscal position of the poet-politician. The author-millionaire, it is averred, has nothing more damaging to the sale of his books to fear, than the destruction of the empire. The day of the establishment of the republic, it is clear that Victor Hugo would have to abandon his character of exile and *émigré*, and go home to France. There, it is doubtful whether he could ever again so well invest his poetical genius and histrionic patriotism, as he has of late years done at Guernsey. The bread of exile has been simply a gold mine for him; he has been told so by venomous detractors, who further pretend that, returned to France and freedom, he would be just as republican and social as ever, if it continued to be of the same importance to his purse.

For years, then, Hugo has been prominent as a party man, and the popular notion of his desires, if not his designs, is rarely contradicted. His wealth is considerable, and daily increasing; and he leads two lives at his comfortable mansion at Guernsey: the one of the admired author and constant student, represented by his publications; the other that of a political *poseur* — a martyr of the stage, with an eye to compensation.

* He was candidate for president of France in 1848, but was forced to withdraw before Louis Napoleon.

During the years from 1861 to 1865, had any one desiring to renew his subscription to the Paris "Constitutionnel" happened to have gone to the office of that journal, of a Sunday afternoon, say from two to three o'clock — no impossible occurrence in Paris, by the way — he would have espied behind the iron fencing to the desk-tops but a solitary individual. Absorbed in his occupation, that individual would have discovered to the visitor only his *calotte*, or little black cap which covers the top of his head, whence escaped a few locks of gray hair, which must have been blond before silvered with age. The person in question was M. Sainte-Beuve, busied at correcting the proof of his *causerie* to appear in Monday's, paper. After having revised the proof with minute attention and untiring pains — in the lonely silence of that great hall, with its vast ceiling, painted by one of the Coypels, which is the outer office of the establishment — M. Sainte-Beuve — *l'oncle Beuve*, as the poet Beaudelaire used familiarly to call him — returned to the little circle of his fellow-contributors to the "Constitutionnel" and others, which formed for an hour or so in the rear office, on the afternoon of the day mentioned. Besides Sainte-Beuve, the group regularly comprised Nestor Roqueplan and Paulin Limayrac, a trio which, of all Paris, was perhaps as well fitted as any to inspect and appreciate the literature, and judge the politics of France of the nineteenth century. Laurentjean, Achard, Aubert, and other lesser, but still considerable lights, swelled the coterie of which Sainte-Beuve was an idol and the oracle. Théophile Gautier, Philarète Chasles, Edmond About, Jouvin, A. Duchesne, Jules Janin, Aug. Villemot, Fiorentino, Sarcy, Paul St. Victor, Claretie, Aubryet, and scores of others — most of whom are, or were, popular authors and well-known journalists — are names which represent a force in matters of literary and art criticism unequalled in the world, and a guild which acknowledged Sainte-Beuve as its illustrious leader.

Criticism in France is a fine art by itself, of which no mere pedagogue can pass professor. A long, serious apprenticeship, with native and manifest ability at the outset, are the

first acquirements for the humblest of its grades. Not in France, as in America, and frequently enough in England, does some bookish knight, his visor down, yet invested with all a critic's might, vault into the arena of literature and art, and bluster forth his dicta with undisputed force; nor, as here, can the flippant sciolist qualify with lofty doubt, or befog with sapient phrase, the opinions of a plastic or indiscriminating class of readers. The public which Sainte-Beuve addressed have long been accustomed to criticise the critic; competent to refute, or quick to modify an unjust judgment, the cultured community has a voice which, whenever raised, is never passed by unheeded. French criticism does not merely expose the faults, but, in friendly temper, it ferrets out, and in an intelligible manner examines, *de vous à mois*, the beauties of a production. It classifies with signs and numbers understood by all. Satire and art, if apt to be over-estimated, are, on the other hand, never confounded with baser stuff; whilst sterling erudition, and that homely, often traceless, toiling after fact, are recognised and duly prized. As the most confident charlatan could not withstand the scrutiny of the average-educated French classes, so no prestige, however lustrous, would blind them to a writer's positive imperfections.

Few men have been more criticised than the prince of critics, Sainte-Beuve himself, and perhaps no author was ever more sensitive to censure or derision. The Duchess d'Abrantès nicknamed him Sainte *Bévue*; and in the "Figaro" of the day, referring to his secession from Victor Hugo and the *romanesques*, Alphonse Karr, in an anonymous article headed, "l'Affreux Bonhomme," berated him with claws and beak, and followed him up with irony and bitter fun—phrases from which diatribe are still extant, as for years the subject of it was often dubbed by witty haters, *l'affreux bonhomme*. "That good soul of a critic," said the "Rivarol" newspaper, in 1842, reviewing Sainte-Beuve's first numbers of the "Histoire de Port Royal," "who plucks and pecks at the works of others, in all the wisdom and charity in which a *dévoté* plucks and pecks at the acts of her less self-delighted neighbor." And again: "That Jansenist who dares to chant

his yellow and sickish prose only under cover of the arches of Port Royal," are Sainte-Beuve and his book graciously yeleft.

The French critics of the day, with no assumption of infallibility, are acute, cultivated, and, in the main, conscientious men. Indiscriminate praise, or sweeping censure, is their horror, as the balance of defect and merit, patiently sought for and brought down, is their real and only test. The society of mutual admiration, as we know it in America—especially in the "modern Athens"—there keeps low its well-cuffed head, though if reciprocal puff be rarer as a systematised thing, the records of French criticism do not show the fraternity to have always been immaculate. The *Cid* had its Scuderi, and for a long time Corneille was persecuted by a d'Aubignac; whilst Bossuet, and Fénelon too, had a Faidit—unfit or knavish judges. Racine was condemned by clever rivals, and as England had a Denny, so France was infested by a Desfontaines, who excused his cunning, but illiterate abuse, upon the plea that he had to live in some way. Janin and Fiorentius (an Italian), of our time, plausibly explained acts of theirs which had been stigmatised as corrupt—where their interest was said to have colored their verdict—but a spot on both will 'always linger. "An excellent critic should be an artist, one with much science and taste, and without prejudice and envy," says Voltaire, but he adds that it would be difficult to find such. So difficult, indeed, that even the great satirist, all critic *hors ligne*, that he set up to be, was possessed by what he should have lacked to personify his compact formula, for he assuredly had envy. The French standard of the present century, as maintained by Gautier, Nillemot, and Jouvin, is one of fundamental laws, with purity, experience, taste, and common sense as articles of faith. Without being Quintilians, perhaps, these are three veteran masters we have named, whom none who know them would deny to be such, not even the witty sneerer at Rousseau, could he wake up and scan their model yet thorough and impartial examinations. Masters, too, of a temper and a justice superior to the measure of Voltaire's pen, and of the plainest prose wherewith to render

an exquisite perception ; masters, by the side of whose swift and simple style the commentaries of Ruskin are tangled and profuse, Mathew Arnold is labored and common-place, and Colley Cibber a pretentious drone.

In France, then, where there is no Paternoster Row and few mere panygerists like Brimley, or finical *inutiles* like Helps—in France all who are recognized as critics are held by a fastidious public to the code. All, with rare exceptions, are tested, reliable and potential men in their various departments, and all, with Sainte-Beuve to head the list, have a large and important place in French *belles lettres*.

The function of criticism he inculcated as he exercised it—with a single-minded order and devotion, which, to the reviewers of the paper-knife school, who can cut up a book which they have not cut open, would appear fanatical and fabulous. Yet his indulgence went hand in hand with his sincerity, and both kept company with his distinctive canons of taste which presided over all his interpretations. His facial expression prompted, and his incomparable talent, his tact, and his unpedantic learning legitimized the deference paid him by old and young of his own and other cliques. There was in his countenance a certain combination of the prelate and the diplomatist, denoting an absence of animosity, and that ever-present delicacy which marked his sallies and his conversation. His large, pointed nose indicated the sturdy inquirer and examiner ; whilst another shade to his features, and a rapid movement of his nostrils showed how little he brooked opposition to, or even divergence from, his literary rescript. Skittish like a blood-horse, irritable like a poet, individual like a pretty woman, the least thrust or reflection straightened him upon his members and put him on his defence. He has also been likened to one of those great iron boilers with the exterior painted white or black, which appear to the ordinary spectator to be cold and calm, and in-offensive. But within their sides struggles a formidable, if prisoned force, which is ever ready to break forth. From the smallest issue conceivable—one opened with the prick of a pin—a jet of boiling vapor will spurt out, sharp and unexpected, to scald and sting the unwary trifier. Sainte-Beuve

was something of that sort—that is Sainte-Beuve from fifty to sixty years of age, who, knowing the strength of his arm, rarely pardoned an emulous offender, but treated him as the Turk would the Moor. Yet, again, like a good-hearted woman, for a word that had touched him, or his suspicion that he had been over harsh, or *that he had conquered*, and the argument and the epigram gave way to social conference and the kindly jest. Opinions passed upon any man, great or small, inevitably disagree, but it was generally conceded that, by himself, the *père critic* was amiable and full of feeling. Proud and difficult with his literary equals, his consciousness of sovereignty taught him a winning consideration for his inferiors.

In the life and times of Louis XIV. he learned the theory of war. With Ampère he studied mathematics, and political economy with Proudhon—two friends whom he ever loved—and, save a speech or two in the senate, his public life outside of his lectures and his writings was zero. For the imperial family he had a true regard, and a strong bond of friendship existed between the princess Mathilde, that enlightened patron of the arts and letters, and their most brilliant devotee. Upon entering the senate he resigned his post with the “Constitutionnel” and a salary of 20,000 francs a year, (his other income amounted to a few hundred dollars only) and considering himself a rich man at present,* he made certain improvements in his modest residence of the rue du Montparnasse, where, with a single servant, he had lived for years. His study remained simple and unadorned as in his younger and poorer days, and was also used as his bed-chamber. Here he breathed his last, with barely the comforts of modern life about him, such was the primitive plainness of the man.

“Les Châtiments” of Victor Hugo, is by many considered his *chef d'œuvre*; not only on account of the skill and sublime beauties of many of its passages, but because it is perhaps the only book where the passion of the author seems real. Elsewhere, when M. Hugo speaks of his affections, his children, or his reveries, one suspects that the native senti-

* His pay as senator was about \$8,000.

ment is colored for effect. Doubtless it is to his verses and his plays that M. Hugo owes his literary pre-eminence ; still, as a poet and a playwright, we have no need nor intention to discuss him here, since his prose alone concerns us in this paper. His characteristic features, as found in his novels and other works, are so salient and striking, that a few of the commoner ones, we think all will allow, require little trained or refined sagacity in order to appreciate them. His "Napoléon le Petit," is a weak and unworthy production from so great a hand — wild denunciation, false prophecy, and a leaden dagger were aimed to stab with sarcasm or the author's scorn. Incorrect in its details of the 2d of December, 1851,* its reckless spite at men and things keeps pace with its inexactitude. In most of the other narrations of Hugo, his partiality for the tragic, the melo-dramatic, or even the shocking in life and nature is perceptible. "Notre Dame de Paris," "Les Misérables," "Les Travailleurs de la Mer," "L'Homme qui rit," abound in emotional, gorgeous, or horrible incident ; albeit many of his former readers have, at present, a much diminished admiration for sensational and fantastic writing. For them the milder and more strictly historical, though likewise dramatic quality of the elder Dumas, may prove monotonous ; Sue is sometimes positively silly, and both are apt to cloy, whilst the individual philosophy of Victor Hugo, as preached in numberless pages of "Les Misérables, or "Les Travailleurs," is heavy in the extreme for everybody. As the schemes and situations of his fictions are depicted with high art and great impressiveness, so is his peculiar theorizing developed with power and vivid illustration, though he seems to care little to persuade. The result is that with all his imperious prolixity, he gains few converts to the right as against the wrong which he decrees, even among those who devour his thrilling romances with wonder and delight. Taking, then, his prose works to compare them with the prose productions of Sainte-Beuve, which is the only means of approaching the semblance of a plane, would be like comparing a huge man-of-war, with her portentous

* The writer of this article was an eye-witness of events Hugo pretends to narrate during that eventful day of the *coup d'état*.

sides and bristling armament, to a pleasure yacht, with its fragile grace and rakish, yet peaceful fashion. Both are ships, as both Hugo and Sainte-Beuve are writers. Meyerbeer's "Prophète," abounding, as it does, in the grandest music, and in palpitating and gorgeous display, and "Le premier jour du Bonheur," of Aubert, which wins by its gentle harmony, and dapper and more tender charm, ought not to be forced to a common test. Yet some such contrast is thrust upon one by the references to, and regrets for his quarrel and known dislike of Hugo—as of dimming consequence to his else brighter mark in letters—in the various obituaries the critic encountered in the Paris press. Far be it from us, to attempt to depreciate the literary renown and empire of Victor Hugo, whose vast originality as a delineator of graphic plots and weird studies and fancies, and whose cunning marvels in verse we, quite possibly, have not the spring and rebound of nerve needful to span or properly investigate. We seek, rather, humbly to state our mind that the broad, and often sombre genius of the poet, playwright, romancer, and political conspirator all combined, when flaunted forth by jealous enthusiasts as a sort of smothering pall, to stifle and conceal the less muscular talent of Sainte-Beuve, only serves as a background, after all, to bring more distinctly into view the subtle, yet sinewy prowess and radiant qualities of the author, the artist, and the judge.

If he who wrote the "Tableau de la Poesie Francaise," and "La Vie de J. Delorme" at the age of twenty-four or five, was then but "a stove into which Victor Hugo put the wood," as Madame de Girardin so maliciously declared, in 1844, when forty-five years of age, the author of "Portraits Littéraires" has lighted, from fuel of his own furnishing, a fire of popular enthusiasm in his behalf, which, followed by the "Causeries de Lundi" (1851-57), when he was fifty-three, grew to be a blaze by the glare of which Hugo, the superior, might have read a new version of his "Moïse," and some other minor pieces, even so far away as Germany. In, 1840 was commenced the "Histoire de Port-Royal"—which is ecclesiastical chronicles of that Jansenist faith, whose votaries have mostly faded away (except, perhaps, in a few

Dutch villages) though the Jansenist theology once ranked a genius like that of Pascal among its upholders, and agitated educated France. This was first delivered as lectures at Lausanne, in Switzerland, and the work was only finished in 1862. In 1845, his "Portraits Contemporaires" was issued, and they have lately been translated and published in this country; but must be read in connection with his "Causeries" to reach a fair estimation of the gifts and versatility of Sainte-Beuve. There is a tender grace which especially pervades his composition in the "Portraits," and this, with his finesse, appears to form a first and natural impulse, hardly betokening that keen, but ever courteous raillery oftener perceptible in the "Causeries." This latter, though a virile power of the author, was one less exercised by him, whilst that genial refinement, which he seems most to delight in, gleams through one and the other of these works.

Not only for Victor Hugo did Sainte-Beuve lack sympathy. To a far greater man he has denied the superior merit now generally allotted to him at home. That skilled teacher in mental vivisection, the author of the *Comédie Humaine*, never forgot certain sharp, it may be unreasonable, strictures passed by Sainte-Beuve upon his earlier writings. Balzac's dislike for him was reciprocated by Sainte-Beuve. It was Balzac who, in the *Revue Parisienne*, in 1842, pointed out the blunder of Sainte-Beuve who, in his *Histoire de Port-Royal*, made Corneille and Chevreau dine together at Port-Royal, instead of the Palais Royal; an error of singular absurdity, which, Balzac declared, merited for him who made it, the *Sainte-Beuve* of Madame d'Abrantès.

But it seems to us that we can hardly be surprised that Sainte-Beuve was not impelled by an intuitive predilection for one who had conceived the "Histoire des Treize," "On mément les mauvaises Chemins," "Une Ténébreuse Affaire," and other gloomy or painful chapters from his tale of our every-day existence. The shocks of ignorant superstition, the dismal in vice, or the harsh in life, no matter how extraordinary, or lamentable, or true, had never intense attraction for him who preferred, and the more so as he grew older, the contemplation of what was sunny, and mild, and

gracious -- the fairer side of nature. Anarchy in the streets, and the freaks of that bloody jade, called liberty by the French, he hated as he did mental anarchy, the Philistine mind and the barbarism of a spurious literature. His principal works proclaim this, as well as his earnestness, his sincerity, and his self-respect. His nice and appreciative mind certainly denoted the feminine instinct, and with the facts of his gossiping curiosity, his passion for elegant and airy composition, his great attention to detail, and marked preference for the society of women, earned for him at one time, among his contemporaries, the appellation of *Sœur Sainte-Beuve*. The brune and the blonde in turn had each been sovereign in the poet's heart, and "*Est ce qu'on choisit quand on aime?*" he once replied to a noble dame, who marvelled at such poor discrimination in his selections.

For the same reason, as specified, probably, most of Hugo's literature especially the prose, was even more distasteful to the fastidious critic, than that of Balzac, as it is not redeemed by that varied and unstrained wisdom, nor qualified by that fascination of analysis, which is so truthful, so rarely untruthful, and so instructive in the "*Comédie Humaine*." It ought also to be said, that the simpler beauties of "*Modeste Mignon*," and such precious and accomplished hints upon matters of art, as are contained in "*Cousin Pons*," and other tales, had modified, in the latter years of his life, Sainte-Beuve's first notion of the author's talent, so that he ceased to murmur when the genius of Balzac was asserted and admired.

Besides those of his works already referred to, Sainte-Beuve published his "*Pansecés d'Aout*," in verse, in 1837; "*Portraits de Femmes*," in 1844, and an "*Etude sur Virgil*," in 1857, which, with his "*Nouveaux Landis*," 1861-65, his contributions to the "*Dictionnaire de la Conversation*," to the "*Athenæum Français*," his unfinished study of Prudhon, and numberless prefaces and essays, comprise the bulk of his literary labor. His poetry was finished and penetrating, but not remarkable; his "*Etude sur Virgil*" was considered worthy of his reputation as a classical scholar, but his master-pieces, as before said, are his "*Portraits*" and

his "Causeries." In these are to be found the elements of the writer's sentiment and sway; his fine apprehension of the pains and joys of the heart, and his witty wisdom of the world, and all are sketched with a deft and chaste use of the French language peculiar to him, erst the poet and novelist who sat in Madame Récamier's *salon* as one of those chosen by the author, to listen to, and pronounce upon the manuscript of Châteaubriand's autobiography. "An Aristippus," says an ardent English eulogist, "minus the vices of that disciple of Socrates, who has criticised almost every great name in European letters, ancient and modern, with scrupulous attention, delicacy, acuteness, etc., etc. We know absolutely nothing of such criticism in England!"

Buloz, who was intimate with Sainte-Beuve, said of him: "*C'est un mouton curé; la rancune l'étouffe et il n'a pas la force de la vengeance*," and we have already alluded to his dictating vanity. This latter was, however, spasmodic, and confined chiefly to his efforts in consolidating and simplifying the critic's place and art, and to his literary dietum. If not an universally popular man, Sainte-Beuve was certainly not soured like Balzac, nor irascible like Hugo. The pre-occupation of the last ten years of his life was the senate, or his place there, which did not give scope for much political hate or strife or unneighborly practice. In religion he was called a Jansenist, *un libre penseur*; but by conviction, not from flippant or fashionable unbelief, for in "La vie de Delorme" he speaks of his scruples at that early age, about entering a catholic church. Cousin, Erefantin, Lammenais, Lacordaire, were at different times the companions of his studies, and by many intimate with him, were declared to be but guides and fellow-travellers in his adventurous journeys after the new and marvellous. "In all my explorations," he says, "I have never surrendered my will nor my judgment. *Mon désir de tout regarder de près m'entraîna à cette série d'expériences qui n'ont été pour moi, qu'un cours de physiologie morale.*" In another place, alluding to the same subject, he is reported to have said: "*En un mot, j'ai observé curieusement et d'aussi près que possible l'intérieure de toutes les souricières, mais je ne suis entré dans aucune. On ne m'a jamais*

pris." Even his defence of Renan's Life of Jesus, has been palliated by a casuistic admirer, who declares it to be "a defence of the head, not by the heart." "*Dans son foi intérieur il la trouvait médiocre,*" says the excuser, "but he wished by his obstinacy to impose on those about him."

One reason that he was looked upon as an unbeliever, was that he never replied to any such charges. He was for a long time, while intimate with Proudhon, called a socialist, and he never contradicted the report, yet subsequent events proved clearly that he was never in any way mixed up with the maxims or the schemes of Rollin, or Blanc, or Hugo. His right of thought he deemed sacred, and not to be questioned, and for liberty of conviction, and of speech, within limits that excluded license, he was ever ready to combat.

His activity was uncommon, and his craving for occupation, doubtless, shortened his days. His articles in the "Temps" newspaper continued to within a short time of his decease. A discourse that he had prepared for the senate he had printed in that journal, when he realized that he would probably never again occupy his seat in the assembly. "*Vous voyez je suis cloué dans mon fauteuil,*" he remarked to a visitor, during his last confinement, "*je ne vis plus-j'assiste.*" His death occurred on the 14th October last, after a painful illness, accompanied by surgical operations.

To the last his philosophy clung to him. His will expressly stated that no religious ceremony, nor any address, should take place at his funeral. He wished simply to be borne to his grave without any deputation from the different bodies to which he had belonged in life, and he even expressed his preference for an early hour of the morning—nine o'clock. "*Je ne veux pas qu' on débite du mauvais Français sur ma tombe,*" it was circulated he had said, and it expressed a poignant apprehension for the great French critic. His wishes were executed to the letter. "*Adieu Sainte-Beuve,*" were the only words uttered by one friendly voice, as the coffin of the life-long journalist and celebrity in letters disappeared from view.

- ART. III.—1. *Sketches of the rites and customs of the Greco-Russian church.* By H. C. ROMANOFF. With introduction by the author of "The Heir of Redcliffe." 8 vo. London. 1868.
2. *A history of the Church of Russia.* By A. N. MOURAVIEFF, chamberlain to his imperial majesty, and under procurator of the most holy governing synod, St. Petersburg, 1838. Translated by the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE, chaplain in Cronstadt to the Russian Company, and B. A. of Morton college Oxford. 8 vo. Oxford. 1842.
3. *Geschichte der Russischen Kirche.* (History of the Russian Church.) VON PHILIPP STRAHL. Halle. 1830.

When Constantine the Great removed the seat of his vast empire from Rome to Byzantium, he probably did not foresee that he was laying the foundation of the ruin of Roman greatness. And when he made Christianity the state religion, he as little anticipated that by changing his capitol he was planting the seed of a schism, in the church, which was to last for centuries. So little can we see ahead! So short-sighted are mortals! Yet these were the almost immediate results of his new policy. For the bishop of Constantinople claimed equal rank with the pope of Rome, and of course, the latter insisted on his own preëminence. These disputes became embittered by the heresies which rent the church, in which controversies the two metropolitans generally took opposite sides. The Arian and the Monophysite heresies, the contention between the Eastern and Western churches as to the mode of observing easter, the iconoclast controversy, the subjugation of Italy by the barbarians, and the rise of the Saracenic empire, all contributed to keep alive the feud between Rome and Constantinople, until the breach became incurable.

We shall trace in the sequel the evil effect this schism had upon Russia, not only as to her political relations with the rest of the world, but as to her social and domestic characteristics. The former branch of the subject has been well handled by ecclesiastical historians, especially by Mosheim, Neander, Hesse, and Strahl, and by Karamsin, the national historian. The latter branch is dealt

with in Madame Romanoff's "Sketches," and it has the more interest from the fact that but little is known in other countries of the social relations of the Greek church to the Russian people; and what is known comes to us principally through the prejudiced testimony of the English traveller, Dr. E. D. Clarke,* who could see nothing good in Russia, and that of the Marquis de Custine,† who is almost equally illiberal.

Madame Romanoff is an English lady, married to a Russian officer who is stationed in the remote province of Perm, on the frontier of Siberia, at the foot of the Ural mountains. This portion of the Russian empire is scarcely known to tourists except by name; but it is in such portions that the national habits have been preserved in their full peculiarity, unaltered by foreign influences. A residence of many years in the district has enabled her to become intimately acquainted with the domestic life of its inhabitants, especially with that of the clergy and the middle class of nobles; and she has made good use of her knowledge by giving to the world pictures, or "sketches" of what particularly struck her. These sketches are disjointed, and apparently were written as the occasion prompted. Put in the form of tales, they enable the writer to introduce lively dialogue; and thus we gain an insight into the modes of thought and expression current among the Russians. Their constant use of terms of endearment shows that the family ties are very strong with them. A diminutive is invented for every proper name, and by this pet appellation the person bearing it is generally distinguished. Thus, Romàn becomes Romuschka, and Nadejda becomes Nadinka. Tyàtinka and Maminka are the appellatives by which children greet their father and mother. And generally, there is among them a tendency to bestow affectionate epithets upon friends and domestics, which strongly reminds us of the French, who are ingenious in inventing such names. As a knowledge of the Russian

* *Travels in Russia, Turkey and Tartary.* By Edward Daniel Clarke, LL.D. London. 1810.

† *L'Empire du Czar, and La Russie.* Par le Marquis de Custine. Paris. 1843 and 1853.

church is essential as a preliminary to the correct understanding of the influence of the national church upon the people, we shall glance at Madame Romanoff's book.

The objects which the authoress proposed to herself in writing it were two, viz., "To present the English with correct descriptions of the ceremonies of the Greco-Russian church, and at the same time with pictures of domestic life in Russian homes." She appears to have thought that her countrymen stood in special need of enlightenment on these points, an opinion apparently shared by Miss Yonge;* and the English public may therefore be grateful to both ladies for their efforts to enlighten them. We, also, may derive some advantage from their labors, while controverting Miss Yonge's statement that "in the memory of many of us the Greek church was almost ignored." We presume that she here means that its existence was almost unknown, otherwise her meaning is by no means clear. Now, none but the very ignorant could fail to know that Russia was a vast empire, and that she had a national church which was commonly called the Greek church. To ignore its influence or its existence would have been absurd. To those who are merely superficially acquainted with the history of Russia it is well known that the power of the Russian clergy, over the masses of the people, was so great that Catharine II., licentious as she was, found herself forced to comply, outwardly, with every rite of their church. Some idea of this power may be formed from the fact that during Suwarrow's campaigns in Italy the Russian soldiers were made to believe that those of them who fell in battle against the French rebels and infidels, would come to life again at the end of three days, and find themselves happily restored to their homes, free from the obligation of serving in the army for the rest of their life. And during the Polish insurrection of 1830-1, the Russian priests impressed upon them the belief that the last judgment would come if the Poles should prove victorious.

The "Sketches" are highly characteristic, and have the appearance of being drawn from life, so much so, indeed, as

* See Introduction to the Sketches.

to suggest the idea that they are translations from Russian originals. We do not assert that they are so, for we have no means of knowing whence Madame Romanoff derived them; but they are decidedly un-English in their style. This is especially the case with the first of them, "Roman the Reader," which depicts the hardships and trials undergone by a studious youth, the son of a poor parish priest, in his efforts to educate himself and get employment. After sundry failures he is appointed "reader" in a parish church, but is struck dead by lightning shortly after on his way home. As a story it is as meagre as can well be; but it illustrates several phases of Russian life, particularly among the clergy, and shows by what peculiar customs and traditions they are bound; and this is the subject with which we are more immediately concerned. One usage, in particular, is curious, and we give it in the authoress's own language:*

"Yes," said Roman, suddenly brightening, as if he had recollected something all at once; "there *is* one thing, as we have touched on the subject, that is always revolting to me—marrying for a place. No! if it were for a ten-thousand-roubles-a-year place, I would not consent to marry any woman unless I liked her, respected her, in a word, loved her."

"And what do you mean by marrying for a place?"

"Do you not know? Ah! that is one of our systems, one of our ways of getting our maidens provided for. For instance, a priest, with an unmarried daughter, dies. Well, she *may* be a nice, amiable girl, that any one might be glad to have for a wife; she *may* be elderly or ugly; worse, still, if she be ill-tempered, or in bad health. The consistory knows every bride in the diocese; besides, the mothers send petitions to the Vlodika,† begging that a bridegroom may be found for her daughter. The candidate for the place is informed that if he chooses to take the girl, the place is his. A married man gets a refusal at once; though, to be sure, if he knows that there is a bride there, he does not think of asking for it."

"Good God!" cried Michael, "what an abuse! go on, brother!"

"The candidate thinks, 'who knows, perhaps the girl may please me?' and off he sets, perhaps some hundreds of versts, to look at her. There are cases on record, that candidates, with mothers and orphan brothers and sisters on their hands, have not been able to make up

* *Sketches*, pp. 36-37.

† "Or sovereign," a title applied to an archbishop.

their minds to such conditions. And the position of the poor girl—what must be her feelings? Other candidates, just for the sake of ‘daily bread,’ as I say, marry cross old frights, for whom nobody sued during the lifetime of the father, and I leave you to imagine the domestic happiness that is to be expected. It is a fact.”

“Is it possible?” murmured Michael, shaking his head.

“And sometimes the girl is pretty and agreeable; the fellow absolutely falls in love, thinks himself a happy man, marries, and finds himself mistaken. Yet some of these marriages prove very happy; but it is an exception to the general rule.”

“I never happened to hear of this horrible plan before. I am astonished at its being permitted by the authorities.”

“Not only permitted,” cried Romàn, who had his “fever” on him; it is one of the greatest evils that exist in the ecclesiastical class. It extends even to readers. But wait a bit,” he continued, setting his teeth and clinching his fist; “their turn will come! Give us time! We must have reform, too; *we need it, God knows, more than all your lay departments of service put together.*”

It should be observed, that Romàn is a church reformer. Throughout the tale he is represented as having a keen perception of the evils connected with the Russian church, and he ultimately joins the party of progress. He died, according to Madame Romanoff, on the 19th July, 1864; hence he did not live to rejoice over the imperial ukase of the 22d May, 1867, whereby this custom, which he so strongly condemned, was prohibited, as well as the long-established rule of places in the church, descending from father to son, or from one relative to another. Nevertheless, the evil consequences of these customs will be felt for many years to come. The principal good done by modern innovations has been to break up that uncompromising orthodoxy which was exacted from every Russian, together with blind submission to the will of the Czar. The Russian is examined as to his orthodoxy every time he goes to confession. Before he is permitted to recount his sins he is thus addressed by the priest: “Tell me, my child, dost thou believe as the catholic and apostolic church, which was planted in the East, and from thence has overspread the world, and in the east and here is immoveable and unchangeable, as taught and delivered, and dost thou not doubt of any of the traditions?”* The per-

* *The Rules and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, by I. G. King, D. D. London, 1772, p. 227.

son thus catechized need have the courage of a Luther to reply otherwise than is expected of him; for if he should not do so he would be forthwith reprimanded and threatened with excommunication unless he recanted and repented. Nor is this threat an idle one, nor the sentence unmeaning. Among the Russian people an excommunicated person is looked upon as an outlaw, not entitled to any civil or religious rights or privileges; and among the rich and powerful classes of the empire—until very recently—though there were, and are, many who are, in fact, unbelievers; yet even they were obliged by the force of public opinion to conform outwardly. The Russian assumes it as an axiom, an article of faith, to believe in the infallibility of his church; and to doubt this is so unpardonable a sin that the disbeliever cannot proceed in his confession nor obtain absolution. Never was there so doggedly orthodox a nation, notwithstanding the fact that heretical sects and hordes of visionary enthusiasts, strongly resembling those of the middle ages in western Europe, have, from time to time, appeared among them, and occasioned much trouble and alarm to the government.

The servility and slavish habit of submission thus created by the power of the church, was adroitly turned to account by the czars, and made the means of riveting their chains on the people. From usurpations on men they proceeded to usurpations on God, and not content with the divine right which they enjoyed in common with other monarchs, they claimed to be the vicegerents of God on earth, and demanded a share of the obedience and worship paid to him. A Russian could obtain remission for every sin except one committed against the czar. The priest might be silent upon all other sins, and leave the chastisement of them to God; but crimes of a rebellious nature must be brought to light and not left unpunished. In the year 1724 Peter the Great issued a decree for the guidance of the secular clergy, article vi. of which runs thus: "Priests shall not reveal anything made known to them at confession, nor upbraid their penitents with their sins should any quarrel subsequently arise between them. Offenders in this particular shall not only

be degraded, but receive corporeal punishment. Treason against the sovereign or the state is, however, excepted, if the guilty does not show signs of repentance, but persists in his criminal designs, *in which case the priest is bound to give information against him.*" By this artful manoeuvre the priests were converted into government spies and informers. But to what depth of degradation must they have fallen to be thus arbitrarily made the tools of a tyrant!

To trace the history of this degradation is not a very inviting task, but it may be profitable to do so, as presenting a remarkable chapter in the history of the human race. Unfortunately, the Russian historians are not always trustworthy; they seem to have had the fear of their church and of the emperor always before their eyes; and they, especially their ecclesiastical writers, have been unable to free themselves from the superstition and the absurd traditions instilled into them from their infancy. One of the most learned of them, Andrew Nicholaëvitch, who was appointed by the Emperor Nicholas I. under-procurator of the governing synod of the Russian church, a most important officer, is a notable instance of this. M. Mouravieff, although a layman, devoted himself to the service of the church. In 1830, while yet a young man, he made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and wrote a description of that country, which he published in 1832. His subsequent works were "Letters on the services of the Eastern catholic church;" "A History of the first four ages of Christianity;" "An exposition of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed," which has received the formal approbation of the synod; "Letters on the salvation of the world by the Son of God;" "A treatise on the law of the Œcumenical church in relation to the Roman and other patriarchal thrones," and "A history of the church of Russia."*

Nowhere is a man, one would think, every way qualified, by long and close study of his subject, to present to the world sound and useful information respecting it. Yet, on opening the last named volume we are met by the following paragraph: "The Russian church, like the other orthodox churches of the East, had an apostle for its founder. St.

* Translator's Preface, p. x.

Andrew, the first called of the twelve, hailed with his blessing, long beforehand, the destined introduction of christianity into our country. Ascending up and penetrating by the Dnieper into the deserts of Scythia, he planted the first cross on the hills of Kieff, and 'See you,' said he to his disciples, 'these hills? On these hills shall shine the light of divine grace. There shall be here a great city, and God shall have in it many churches to his name.' Such are the words of the holy Nestor, the monk and annalist of the Pechersky monastery, that point from whence christian Russia has sprung. But it was only after an interval of nine centuries that the rays of divine light beamed upon Russia from the walls of Byzantium, in which city the same apostle, St. Andrew, had appointed Stachys to be the first bishop, and so committed, as it were, to him and to his successors, in the spirit of prescience, the charge of that wide region in which he had himself preached Christ. Hence the indissoluble connection of the Russian with the Greek church, and the dependence of her metropolitans during six centuries upon the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, until, with its consent, she obtained her own equality and independence in that which was accorded to her native primates."*

It has seldom fallen to our lot to meet with passages in history so replete with baseless assertion. There is not the slightest historical evidence that St. Andrew ever was at Kieff, or even at Byzantium. The traditions to that effect were the inventions of the fourth and fifth centuries; that is to say, these traditions then assumed a definite shape, for a number of them had been floating about in the christian world from the time of Eusebius, of Caesarea, the great historian of the early church. About the middle of the second century Hegesippus committed to writing everything he thought worthy of preservation in the apostolic traditions.† Eusebius has related these and others in his ecclesiastical history, written about the year 324, and this is the earliest mention of the visit of St. Andrew to Rus-

* *History*, p. 7. † Eusebius, ii. *Ecc. ii.*; 28; iii., 16, 19; iv. 7 s., 11, 22.

sia, which is about as authentic as that of St. Paul to England. M. Mouravieff, however, does not have recourse to Eusebius, or Hegesippus, or Iranaeus, or Tatian, who were among those likely to have heard anything respecting the fate of the apostles; but he anchors his faith upon the annals of Nestor, a Greek monk of Pechersky, whom he styles the father of Russian history, and who died about the year 1116.* This is taking history at second hand with a vengeance. But more than this! The "Annals" of Nestor were themselves collected and put together by the patriarch Nikon (A. D. 1653-67) more than 500 years after their author's death, and by him revised and corrected, along with many other ancient records, which were found to be full of errors and discrepancies. From this musty source our historian garners up the fact of the appointment of the mythical Stachys by St. Andrew to be the first bishop of Byzantium, to whose charge he committed all Seythia! But the climax is in the deduction. "Hence," says he, "the indissoluble connection of the Russian with the Greek church!" As there was no Greek church, properly so called, until the reign of Constantine the Great, or nearly three centuries after the death of Christ and of St. Andrew, it would be as well if M. Mouravieff would account for the preservation of the charge given to Bishop Stachys, of Byzantium. The labors of St. Andrew, in Seythia, must have been almost thrown away, since, notwithstanding them, and the existence of the Greek church, which he founded, M. Mouravieff himself states that, *so far as is known*, Askold and Dir, two princes of Kieff, and the companions of Ruric, were the first Russians who embraced christianity,† about the year 866. What can be said of a historian who gravely tells us that when, in that year, the Russians made their appearance in armed vessels before the walls of Constantinople, the patriarch Photius took the virginal robe of the mother of God from the Blachern church and plunged it beneath the waves of the strait, when the sea immediately boiled up from underneath and wrecked the vessels of the heathen, who, struck with awe, believed in that God who had

* Preface, p. 7. *History of the Church of Russia*, p. 32. † History, p. 8.

smitten them, and became the first fruits of their people to the Lord? *

With regard to the real origin of the Russian church, the truth appears to be, that it owes its existence, as a branch of the Greek church, to the accident of the geographical position of the country. Excluded from the western world by her remoteness, by the difficult and inhospitable routes through which she was to be reached, and by the barbarism of her inhabitants, Russia, during the early ages of christianity, had no communication with christian nations, save through the Greeks. Hence she derived her notions as to what constituted christianity. She could not well do otherwise than become essentially Greek, as regarded her national religion. Askold and Dir were converted at Constantinople, and they returned to Kieff to sow the seeds of christianity there. Eighty years after their time, mention is made of the church of St. Elias, in that city, where Prince Igor and the Byzantine ambassadors swore to the observance of a treaty. The Emperor Basil, the Macedonian, sent a bishop to the Russians. And in Codinus' catalogue of the sees, subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, the metropolitan see of Russia appears as early as the year 891. It was to Constantinople that the widowed Princess Olga took her way, (A. D. 965,) to gain a knowledge of the true God, and there she received baptism at the hands of the patriarch Polyanetes, the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself standing sponsor. Having taken the name of Helena, she received from the patriarch instruction in christian doctrine, and returned to Russia (which she governed during the minority of her son Sviatoslaff,) to spread the new faith and to add one more illustrious woman's name to the long roll of those heroines who did so much to establish christianity in other lands. She acknowledged the patriarch of Constantinople as the head of the church in Russia, and in this she was followed by her successors until the year 1583, long after the taking of Constantinople by the Turks. In that year, on the death of Dionysius, metropolitan archbishop and regent, the

* Ibid.

archbishop of Rostoff, Job, was made patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, and the Russian church became independent of the patriarch of Constantinople.

Now if there had been no schism between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, the Russian church would have formed part of the universal christian church, just as the churches of France and Spain would have done. But as it happened that there arose an inappeasable quarrel between them, Russia naturally followed in the footsteps of her instructor and mother, the Greek church. There is no need to trace the history of this schism : it may readily be found in the pages of Gibbon, Mosheim and Neander.

It would scarcely help us to understand the present position of the Russian church, affected as it now is, and has been, by a variety of political and social convulsions, extending over many centuries, whereby the character of the Russian people has been considerably modified. It will be well to point out wherein their church differs from the Roman, and to trace the fortunes of it from the time when it assumed a national character. And this is what we propose to do in the present article ; yet there is one important consideration connected with the schism between the eastern and western churches which must not be lost sight of,—and that is, that Russia was a great loser by it ; for, as she took sides with Greece, she was cut off from the community and advantages of European civilization and sympathies. She thus became isolated ; and, consequently, all the reforms and aspirations of the rest of Europe passed unnoticed by her. Even the Crusaders appealed to her in vain ; and the patriarch of Constantinople, from personal hatred to the Latins, transferred his see to Nicea, in Bithynia, rather than have anything to do with them. Had the Greeks and Russians coöperated with the Latins in the attempt to drive the Saracens out of Palestine, that object might have been achieved ; but, as they did not, and, on the contrary, did all they could to thwart the Crusaders, they were punished ultimately by the oppression of themselves by the infidels. The Greek church was enfeebled by oriental apathy and ignorance, while the Latin was preserving the intellectual treasures of

antiquity. In the west were progress and the germs of freedom, but in the east were slavishness, corruption, and venality. The taint spread to Russia, and poisoned her vitals. What would have been her destiny had she received her faith from Europe instead of Asia?

At the time of the introduction of christianity into Russia there were two religions struggling for empire. One was the worship of Peroun, the Thunderer, the ancient religion of the Slavi; the other that of Odin, the religion of the Scandinavian pirates, who ultimately subjugated the Slavi, and gave them the name of Russians. The latter being the religion of the hated few, soon disappeared, and christianity was left to contend with Peroun alone. But the worship of Peroun was the religion of the multitude, supported by long usage and identified with the popular democratic institutions, while christianity was the religion only of the more enlightened class. Thus the Princess Olga, with all her zeal, was able to do but little, even with her son Sviatoslaff, and she was forced to content herself with indoctrinating her young grandson, Vladimir (afterwards surnamed the Great), who, thus trained, watched his opportunity, on his accession to the throne, for establishing the new faith. In concert with the elders of his council, he sent chosen men to make inquiries into the merits of the different systems of religion then prevailing, and thus prepared the public mind for what he intended should follow. While these agents were prosecuting their inquiries, Vladimir suddenly attacked Cherson, in the Tauride, a possession of the emperors. By stratagem he got possession of the city (A. D. 992). Then he sent to Constantinople to demand the hand of the Princess Anna, and the emperor consented to give it to him on condition that he embraced christianity. The prince acceded; the envoys reported favorably as to the Greek church to the Russian people, and the scheme was ripe. Vladimir and his suite were publicly baptized by the bishop of Cherson, at that city. He returned to Russia, with his bride, and erected in Kieff a church, that of St. Basil, on the very mount which had been sacred to Peroun, adjoining his own palace. Thus was Russia "christianized." (?)

Now what was the christianity thus imported into Russia? It was that which had been formed by a succession of councils and decrees of emperors. In the main, the doctrines of the eastern and western churches were the same, with the exception of certain views as to the two natures in Christ, the observance of easter, the administration of baptism, and the ceremonials of the church service. The canons of the councils which the eastern church adhered to, the ecclesiastical laws of the Greeks, and some portions of their civil law, together with the scriptures, were taken as the basis of ecclesiastical administration in Russia. The oriental systems of monasticism and asceticism were likewise adopted, and tithes were established by Vladimir for the support of the clergy. The country was apportioned into bishoprics, and the bishops were ordained by metropolitan bishops who had received their ordination from the patriarch of Constantinople. The right of judging causes was granted to the bishops and the metropolitan of Kieff, and they judged according to the *Nomocanon* of the Greeks.* At the grand ceremony wherein these grants and privileges were conferred, Vladimir said—"If any one shall transgress this, my ordinance, which I have enacted in conformity with the ancient Greek *Nomocanon*, may the curse light upon him!" The ordinance more especially referred to in this anathema was the law which he proclaimed, viz.: that no one of his successors, nor of the boyars, nor any other person, even unto the end of the world, should venture to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the clergy. This ordinance was deposited, in writing, in the church of the Holy Mother of God at Kieff. It is given at full length in the notes to M. Mouravieff's work.†

The sovereign of Russia thus divested himself, his successors, and his nobility, of extraordinary judicial powers, in order to confer them on the clergy. He gave them jurisdiction in almost every case of crime and heresy, disputed property, wills, legacies, marriage and divorce;

* As to this *Nomocanon*, a short account of it will be found in the preface to Beverege's *Synodicon*. Also in Hase's *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 135-260.

† *History of the Church of Russia*. Notes, pp. 357-8.

but reserved to the sovereign the right to punish treason and rebellion. The bishops were empowered to supervise the measures, weights, scales and balances of the town and the market. Heavy fines could be imposed on all offenders, who were also threatened with everlasting punishment hereafter. In judicial matters between a person belonging to the church and another man, the tribunal appointed to judge the cause was to be partly civil and partly ecclesiastical; but in matters in dispute between "persons belonging to the church," the metropolitan or bishop was to have sole jurisdiction. The list of persons belonging to the church was sufficiently comprehensive; it comprised "the stewards (tious) of their estates, the priests (popes), deacons and their children, the wife of a priest, and the whole body of clerks; moreover, the monk, the nun, the woman who bakes the holy bread, the cloistered pilgrim, the physician, the man who by a holy miracle is restored to health, the slave whom his master releases for the good of his soul, the stranger, the blind and the lame; especially the monasteries, the hospitals, and establishments for the care of guests and strangers."

This may be called the charter of the Russian church. By it the clergy, at one bound, acquired an amount of power which the Roman church, after centuries, failed to gain; and, in addition to the enormous privileges before-mentioned, each bishop possessed the right of appointing all the priests, deacons and inferior servants of the church in his dioceses. If they were guilty of any fault, he had power to suspend them, and, after trial, eject them. He had also the right of appointing all the archimandrites or abbots and abbesses to the religious houses in his diocese, of raising them to higher rank, or depriving them of it. The metropolitan had no right to interfere in the affairs of the diocese; the only power he had over a bishop was to try him, if any accusation were brought against him, and, if he were found guilty, to degrade him.* The bishops were, in fact, independent princes, their relation to the czar being undefined, but they owed him allegiance, and had no control over his public policy, and

* Mouravieff, *History of the Church of Russia*, pp. 359, 361.

very little over his private conduct, as the history of Russia testifies.

We can now understand how it came about that the church possessed so much influence over the people; and if we add to this the ignorance and superstition of the masses, the tyranny of the boyars, who held almost absolute power over the serfs, and the despotic and generally cruel character of the czars, there will be no difficulty in accounting for the personal appearance of the Russians, as described by travellers. Destitute of all legislative protection, beaten like hounds by their boyars, on the least provocation, and frequently on none at all, having no right of property on which they could rely, subject to the harrowing knout for any offence against the laws, it is no wonder that they became habitually sullen and melancholy, that their features became distorted and degraded, their countenances mean and repulsive, their minds narrow and their feelings deadened. Under the iron rule of their czars, and the want of anything like real instruction in christianity from their ignorant and servile clergy—the bulk of the latter being as servile towards their superiors as themselves—they have become a distinct race, wholly unlike the peasants of the western Slavonian tribes.

We ought also to take into account the cruel oppression they suffered from the Tartars for so long a period, though we think that the effects of the subjugation of their country by the golden horde have been overrated. Surely their degradation could not have been much greater during that period than it was in Yaroslav's time (A. D. 1019-54). That prince framed a code of laws which were, however, but modifications of, or improvements upon the old traditional laws, and which exhibit fully the darkness and barbarity of that age. This code divided the population into three classes—the nobles, the freemen, and the slaves. For the murder of a boyar, or thane of the duke, the highest penalty was 80 grionas; for a page of the duke, his cook, or other domestics, for a merchant, or a sword-bearer of a boyar, and for every free Russian, without distinction of origin, 40 grionas; for a woman, half the usual fine. No fine for killing a slave;

but if killed without sufficient cause, the value to be paid to the master ; for a serf belonging to a boyar, or free Russian, 5 grionas to the owner ; for a superintendent of a village, an artisan, a schoolmaster, or nurse, 12 grionas ; for a female servant, 6 grionas to the master and 12 to the state. Prisoners of war, and their posterity, were condemned to perpetual slavery. Insolvent debtors became slaves by law ; and all freemen who married slaves unconditionally, participated in the servitude. Horse-stealing was visited with imprisonment for life. But the most characteristic penalty was that of 12 grionas for pulling a man by the beard, or knocking out a tooth.*

What can be said of a state of society wherein a man might murder a lady for three dollars, a woman of the middle class for a dollar and a half, and a female servant for one dollar and thirty-five cents ? The degree of barbarism which this indicates was too low to be elevated by such teaching as the Greek church, itself corrupt, ignorant, and servile, could impart. We find, accordingly, that recourse was had to numerous rites and ceremonies in order to impress the minds of the savage population. Magnificent churches were built ; splendid vestments were worn by the clergy ; the worship of images of saints became common ; the use of bells was introduced ; and so much of the wealth of the nation was absorbed by the priesthood for these purposes, that in the twelfth century there were more than four hundred churches and chapels in the city of Kieff alone ! † The proportion was equally great in every city in the empire, and as the rule grew up that the sons of priests, and the inferior orders in the church, should follow their fathers' profession, and that the daughters should marry among members of these orders—though this was not imperative—the priesthood became exceedingly numerous ; and, notwithstanding the immense wealth of the church at large, very many of the lower orders were poor. Those who will take the trouble to read Madame Romanoff's book will obtain a good notion of the condition of these ecclesiastics.

* *History of Russia* (Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia), vol. 1, p. 88.

† Mouravieff, *History of the Church of Russia*, p. 32.

"Romàn, the Reader," is a tale designed to illustrate it. The "reader" is the lowest in rank among those who officiate in the Russian churches. There are two classes of "readers," viz. : lay and clerical. The latter are sons of the clergy, born and brought up to the church, and they are appointed and ordained by the proto-pope, or high priest of the district, after due examination as to their fitness. The lay readers, or *ponomàrs* (unordained), are also appointed by the proto-pope, but are only so on trial, and they must undergo an examination before consecration. Their duties are simply to read the litanies aloud, and they are not allowed to lay their hands on the "antimins," or communion-cloth—an indispensable appendage to the altar. This antimins is so holy a thing that it is to be touched only by priests and deacons. It is consecrated by and obtained from the archbishop, and is brought from him in a case made for the purpose, which is worn on the breast of the bringer during the journey.*

The reader in time becomes a deacon or village priest, without priest's orders ; but on taking holy orders he becomes a full priest. The next step is that of proto-pope, or high-priest. ; then that of bishop ; then archbishop, metropolitan and primate. Few men of humble origin can look forward to elevation to the highest offices of the church ; these were formerly in the patronage of the patriarch of Moscow ; but in the year 1721, Peter the Great abolished the patriarchate and established in its place the Holy directing Synod, an ecclesiastical college which was to take cognizance of matters connected with religion, but finally refer their decisions to the sovereign, who thenceforth became the head of the church. In the ordinance he issued under the title of "Spiritual regulations" the motives are explained which induced him to effect this change, and the laws enumerated by which the conduct of the clergy was to be governed. These regulations constitute the basis of the established church of Russia as it now exists. They distinctly state that no one but the sovereign shall be recognized as its head, and the bishops, on

* *Sketches*, p. 51.

entering on their spiritual office are required to swear to this article. They are, moreover, bound by oath to observe all the statutes and canons of the church, and likewise, by article six, to teach and enjoin the priests within their dioceses to prevent the increase of schism, superstition and foreign rites, and by article seven they are prohibited from interfering in secular concerns on any pretence whatever. In connection with this bold measure of Peter, we may mention, that he also taxed the clergy like the rest of his subjects, reduced the number of monks and nuns, converted many of the monasteries into hospitals for invalid soldiers, and caused the Bible to be printed and distributed. He further procured from the patriarch of Constantinople, and through him from the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, the recognition of the Holy directing Synod as a patriarchal institution, equal in dignity to the patriarchal office.* Thus Russia, being the only great political power of the persuasion of the Greek church, obtained the tacit acknowledgment that she has a protectorial right over the rest of the oriental churches—a right which she has exercised on many occasions since the time of Peter, sometimes with benefit to Greek christians of Turkey, but always with danger to the peace of Europe.

Notwithstanding the daring and comprehensive schemes of Peter, however, his measures have failed to infuse any degree of independence of character into the Russian priesthood. They have adhered to their routine life and ritual, and produced no original thinkers, or men of great literary eminence as the Roman Catholic church has done. They are like the Levites, a class to themselves. Madame Romanoff happily illustrates this feeling in a speech which she puts into the mouth of her hero, Român.† In a dialogue between him and his friend Michael Haraldin, wherein the latter tries to arouse some aspiration in Român's breast, and insists on the sin of entering into holy orders for the mere sake of a living. Român exclaims :

“What ! not enter the church ! How am I to live, then ?” “As you

* Mouravieff, *History of the Church of Russia*, p. 287. † *Sketches*, p. 34.

please ; as you can." "But I have just lost my father. My mother and sister look to me for support. I am the only son. My father left us nothing but a small house and its contents. What can I be ? What am I fit for ?" "Do not be in too great a hurry, Român Dmitriêvitch. Neither you nor I can decide here, in a few moments, what you ought to do, or what you are fit for. Take time to reflect. Consult with your own heart and conscience. Ask yourself if you wish, above all things, to be a priest, and compel yourself to give an answer—a clear, honest answer !" "I never thought of being anything else," replied Român, with a gesture of impatience. "We are like the Levites you know. We sons of the clergy are born and brought up with the prospect before us, of following the same calling as our fathers, grand-fathers—ancestors, in fact ; we grow up with the conviction that priests, deacons, or readers we must be. Our parents do not approve of our becoming laymen ; many will not give their blessing to such sons as feel an insurmountable aversion to the church—fancy that ! Perhaps the fellow might make a good military man, civil servant of the crown, or something ; but if the father deprives him of his parental blessing, what can he do but be ordained ? And then our marriages. I do not suppose you would find half a dozen fathers or mothers in our whole diocese but would sooner see their son married to the ignorant daughter of a country reader, than an educated girl of the nobles. But there, what's to be done ? And the consistory, and vladika ! they cannot endure departure from the church. Lastly, finally, and in conclusion, the church will give me daily bread, without which, alas ! man cannot live."

This interest is characteristic of the lower orders of the Russian clergy. How widely the Russians differ from the people of western Europe ! But then their priests are allowed to marry, and to remain unmarried is not looked upon with favor, while among the clergy of the Roman Catholic church celibacy is rigorously enforced. This has the effect of deterring young men from entering into holy orders, and forces them to turn their attention to other avocations. Besides, the catholic clergy are for the most part poor and self-denying ; at least in a worldly point of view, their laborious life is by no means enviable.

It is strange what a hold the system of perpetuating certain avocations in families has upon the Russians. Not only does the office of priest descend from father to son, but in almost every trade the son succeeds the father. Whole villages may be met with, inhabited entirely by one class of workmen : shoemakers in one, carpenters in

another, tailors in a third. The Russians, in this respect, are truly oriental; unchangeable in their habits and tastes, and conservative in the most bigoted sense of the word. Like all Asiatic nations, splendor and glitter have great attractions for them; and this taste is gratified in the lavish decoration of their churches, and the gaudy display resorted to in their rites and ceremonies. They, however, omit, or rather, will not allow any organ or instrumental music in them; the choristers being the only means employed to produce harmonious sounds. Their churches are principally built in the Byzantine style, having a long body, a cupola over the east end, and the belfry at the west. Some have several belfries at the corners, and small ones have their bells hung in a little tower on the top of the cupola. Most of them are surmounted by a cross, and are frequently covered with bright metallic plates.

One characteristic of the Russian church is, that it does not allow worshippers to sit down. There are no seats in the churches, and both priests, readers, singers, and congregation are compelled to stand during the entire service.* What a contrast to our luxurious places of public worship, with their well-lined pews, spring-cushioned seats, hassocks, and foot-stools! Another peculiarity is, that the altar screens are hung with pictures in silver or plated *vizas*; that is, they are completely covered with metallic plates, chased and ornamented, which represent the clothing of the saints; and there are apertures left for the face, hands, and feet of the painting to be visible. Before each picture are candlesticks or suspended lamps of immense size, capable of containing thirty or forty candles. The priests officiate behind the screen, which has three doors in it, and when these are closed, nothing can be seen of the service. There is a throne before the principal or "royal" door, on which are placed the gospels, a gold or gilt cross for the congregation to kiss, a small chest, or catafalque, with a box in it containing the holy elements, and a silk handkerchief, in which is wrapped the antimins.

The conservatism of the Russians has in nothing been more strongly manifested than in their church. Since its

* *Sketches*, p. 83.

foundation this church has retained the creed that was first delivered to it. For nearly 900 years there has been no alteration in its doctrines, services, rites, ceremonies and discipline. If, therefore, we would desire to know in what it differs from the church of Rome, we may compare it as it was in the days of Olga with what the catholic church is now. During the whole of the period which has since elapsed, both clergy and laity among the Russians have enjoyed free access to the Scriptures, and made use of the "Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom;" whereas in the west the Bible was for ages a sealed book. And when it was opened there sprang up a multitude of sects which rent Christendom with their disputes, and drenched Europe with blood; nor is the strife entirely over yet. In Russia, upon the other hand, there have been very few troublesome heresies, but an almost unbroken unanimity of belief. The Russian hierarchy claims an uninterrupted succession from the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and from the apostles themselves; though not exclusively from St. Peter. The Greek form of christian worship has been planted by them wherever Russia has acquired dominion, and thus the wild tribes of Perm, Viatha, the Ukraine, Siberia, and Kamtschatka have received some of the light of christianity. The Russian church has, throughout her career, steadfastly supported and helped to preserve the state—through all dangers and difficulties, feuds and distractions, the wars with the Poles, the dominion of the Tartars, the civil wars of the Pretenders, and those of disputed succession. It is not too much to say that had the state been deprived of this bond of union, the great Russian empire would have been dissolved into a number of petty, independent states; or, perhaps, barbarous and wandering tribes, like those still found within her territories, and have ceased to exist as an independent whole.

The Russian church can accordingly boast of a countless number of patriots among her ministers—men who had cheerfully laid down their lives, or sacrificed themselves in every way for the honor and safety of the nation, and for the promotion of order and peace. But it is equally true that she cannot

boast of many learned and eloquent men, who have commanded the world's admiration. We meet with no St. Bernard, Gregory the Great, Hildebrand, Benedict, Francis of Assisi, Abelard, Bossuet, Massillon, De La Salle, Richelieu, or Fenelon among her priesthood. We must be content with such men as the monk, Nestor, the patriarch, Nikon, the metropolitans, Cyprian, Macarius and Eugenius, Iob, Hermogenes, and Philaret—men known only to those who are familiar with the annals of Russia. There has been but little demand upon the Russian clergy hitherto for intellect, eloquence or learning. Such gifts would be wasted upon congregations unable to appreciate them. When the people shall wake from their long torpor, and become educated, men of a superior order will, doubtless, be forthcoming in their church.

Among the heresies which have troubled the Russian church, that of the Strigoluiks was one of the most remarkable; but M. Mouravieff passes it over with the slightest possible notice,* as though it were scarcely worthy of attention—a very unfair and injudicious course for a historian to take. This sect first appeared A. D. 1371. Its founders were a layman named Karp and a deacon named Nicetas. They taught first in Pskoff and then in Novgered, where they met with great success. They denounced the clergy for the disorders which prevailed in the church, and denied their power to bind and loose. They also denied the necessity of confession to a priest, saying that confession to God was enough. They maintained that St. Paul gave power to any one to teach, and rejected episcopal ordination, electing their own teachers. They denied that the clergy could impart the grace of the Holy Ghost to the members of the church, but claimed the power of imparting it themselves. They rejected the offering of oblations to the dead, or singing or celebrating service over them. This sect had many votaries, notwithstanding that Nicetas was degraded from the diaconate, and his partisans excommunicated; and Karp was thrown into the Volkoff by the populace of Novgered. It died out, however, after a while.

* *History of the Church of Russia*, p. 65.

The doctrines of Calvin penetrated into Russia and occasioned great trouble in the church. Crafty teachers of those doctrines gave them out as part of the orthodox confession. Cyrill Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, although he condemned Calvinism, did not decidedly and openly oppose it, and for this he was anathematized by his successor, Cyrill of Beraea. But the agitation still continued, and a synod was convoked at Iassy, in Moldavia, which condemned the teachings of Calvin. The Russian metropolitan, Peter Mogila, with four bishops, confirmed the acts of this synod, and, by command of Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople, his exarch, Meletius Syriga, revised and finally corrected the orthodox confession. This confession received the confirmation of the eastern patriarchs, and thus the peace of the Greco-Russian church was secured. The Reformation, which caused such terrible convulsions in Europe, produced no effect in Russia, and neither Lutheranism nor Calvinism has met with any success there. The orthodox confession was finally accepted throughout the oriental church, excepting the Nestorian. What would have been the effect upon Russia, had the Reformation penetrated there, is matter of curious speculation.

One of the peculiar characteristics of the Russian church is the extreme minuteness of detail in her ceremonial. In this respect there is considerable difference between her and the Latin church. In christening, churching, confession, communion, marriage, burial, ordination, consecration, adult unction, adoption, bishop's visitation, and other rites, the minutiae are surprising. Take, for example, the mode of administering the Lord's supper, as a specimen of them. It is administered on Saturday, but the ceremony really begins on the preceding day, after vespers, when the deacon or priest reads aloud to those who intend to communicate the next morning, an address or exhortation, interspersed with psalms, ejaculations, and reflections. This address is called "the rules," and is immensely long. After the hearing of these 'rules' no food whatever ought to be taken until after receiving the sacrament. Confession has to be made either that evening after vespers, or on communion day, after matins. All persons

who are entitled to wear uniforms, appear in full dress, but without their swords. Married ladies wear their handsomest dress, a lace shawl, or a mantle, and a cap with ribbons, but not flowers. Young ladies dress in white muslin as for a party, but it is the fashion for old ladies to array themselves in the clothes they intend to be buried in, with the addition of a shawl or a mantle, and a cap made for a living being, not for a corpse!

Before leaving home the communicants kiss everybody, servants and all. On arriving at church they take off their cloaks and furs, approach the altar-screen, prostrate themselves before the pictures in it, and kiss them. They return to their standing-place, for no sitting down is allowed. The liturgy proceeds in the usual manner. When the royal gates are slowly opened the deacon appears with the cup in his two hands, held on a level with his face, and covered with an embroidered velvet napkin. He then pronounces the words, "In the fear of the Lord, and in peace, come ye!" and all the communicants approach the steps of the altar of sacrifice, from which the Eucharist is administered. The priest then takes the cup from the deacon and pronounces very slowly the articles of belief on the subject, the communicants repeating them after him. The napkin is then removed from the cup, which contains tiny morsels of bread mixed with wine, to which is added a little warm water in remembrance of that which poured from the wound of Jesus. The priest takes in a spoon a morsel of this bread with a little wine, puts it into the mouth of the communicant, who has first to make a devout prostration and fold his hands across his breast, saying, "The servant of God, A. B., communicates in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The choir sings, "Receive ye the body of Christ, taste ye the fount of everlasting life" an indefinite number of times during the service. The deacon holds a silk handkerchief under the chin of the communicant to prevent the possibility of a drop falling to the ground, and wipes his lips with it afterwards; the communicant then kisses the edge of the cup, a type of the wounded side of Christ, crossing himself, but without prostration, in honor of the presence of the sacrament. He

then goes up to a little table, where a reader stands with a tiny ladle always replenished with wine and water, intended as a sort of rinsing after the eucharist, and tiny loaves of bread, from the sides of which the morsels of bread used in the celebration were cut out with the spear. He lays on the salver an offering according to his ability, and employs himself in private devotions until the rest of the people have received the sacrament. The priest having concluded the liturgy, is at liberty to perform a short special service of thanksgiving for the spiritual comfort received, and to present the cross to be kissed.*

Religious people in Russia pass really fatiguing lives, if they attend all the services of the church. When young they must learn the short catechism, the Lord's prayer, the Nicene creed, the ten commandments, the hymn to the Holy Ghost, the Russian version of "Hail Mary," the hymn of praise to her, the morning and evening prayers before and after meat, the stories from the Old Testament, and the history of the Lord. There is no such ceremony as confirmation in the Greco-Russian Church;† the next step after baptism is communion, which the child receives twice a year until it is seven years old; then it is taken to confession, and receives a month's preparation from the priest for attending communion in church. After this the child ought to attend all the stated services when practicable—vespers, matins, and mass.

This endless routine of ceremonies and rights, with occasional exhortations from the priest, constitutes the religious training of the mass of the Russian people. They fast more than any other christians. There is the great fast or lent, which lasts forty-nine days; the Assumption fast, which lasts from the 1st of August to the 15th; the Petroffsky, which extends from Trinity Monday to St. Peter's day, (the 29th June,) and consequently differs in length, according to the time when Easter falls; and the Christmas, or Philip fast, which lasts from St. Philip's day (the 15th November,) to Christmas day. Besides these there are the Wendesdays and Fridays through-

* *Sketches*, p. 132-5.

† *Ibid.*, p. 117.

out the year, except during certain weeks called "Sploshnaïa weeks," an untranslatable term. The Russians hold carnival for a week, called "butter-week," before the beginning of lent, which is on the Monday after Quinquagesima, but meat is not eaten for the last time until Sexagesima Sunday. During butter-week Russia is a scene of wild enjoyment. In the large cities there are morning and evening performances at the operas and the theatres, public ice-hills, fairs with shows, circuses, conjurers, and acting in the open squares; visiting, driving in sledges, private theatricals, costume balls and other amusements are resorted to, and no business is done.

The recklessness of the Russian character is fully illustrated at this season. The Russians enjoy furious driving and violent exercise, such as sliding down ice-hills at such a pace as to render the feat dangerous, and building citadels of hard-beaten snow to be attacked by one party and defended by another, the weapons used being blunt old swords, dead dogs, cats, hens, &c., and snowballs. In this last amusement, the mayor and city officials take part, and the vanquished are compelled to treat the victors to refreshments at the nearest tavern. The probability is, that such violent exercises and such complete surrendering of themselves to wild excitement at this season, are safety-valves for the long pent-up spirits of the people. Under so long a course of tyranny of the most brutal description, the Russian has become a being in whom all self-respect and independence of character has been stamped out; and it will take a long time for him to retrieve his humanity under the more enlightened government which now exists. The Emperor Alexander, has done much towards bettering the condition of his people. The abolition of serfdom on the imperial domains was a grand step, giving emancipation to twenty-two millions of peasants, but there is much more to be done in training them to be men. This is a work in which a well-educated and enlightened clergy would be the most effective agents, and it is to be hoped that with the rapid means of transit now springing up everywhere, even in the heart of Russia, that ancient and semi-barbarous nation may be brought into direct contact with all the civilizing influences of modern science.

The Russians possess many noble qualities, which only need development and cultivation to place them in the foremost rank; but an unenlightened church is an anachronism which cannot stand much longer. There is so little real fundamental difference between the tenets of the Greco-Russian and the Latin churches that a union of the two would not be impossible. It is within the range of probability that something of the sort may be effected before very long; and for the sake of civilization, as well as religion, such a result is to be anxiously wished for by every friend of humanity.

The inter-communion between the Russian and the Anglican churches has never been broken off by any open act of either party, although the Greek patriarchs have for centuries ceased to hold intercourse with the British prelates. The separation has arisen mainly from each having erroneous notions of the other, or, in other words, knowing very little of each other. There are parties in the Anglican church for whom the glittering, showy ceremonial of the Russian church would prove attractive, and there are many more to whom it would be repulsive.

ART. IV.—1. *History of the Female Sex.* BÖTTIGER.

2. *History of Women.* 2 vols., 4to. ALEXANDER. 1779.

3. *Les Femmes.* 3 vols. SÉGUR. 1802.

It is seldom agreeable to argue with the ladies; to refute them is ungallant, and to pass censure on them is odious. Sometimes, however, they have to be argued with, refuted, and even censured, for their own good. We cannot but regard the present as one of these occasions; for we hold that the "woman's rights" movement is no honor to our civilization, but rather discreditable. If its tendency were to improve the condition of the sex, none would give it more hearty support than ourselves; it is precisely because it has the opposite tendency that we oppose it.

If we are wrong in this, a question or two may produce a train of thought that will aid in explaining the fact. We,

therefore, ask, what is woman most esteemed, loved and honored for? Is it for her boldness? for her courage? for her independence of man, or for her readiness to compete with him publicly, late and early? In other words, is woman most endeared to man in proportion as she is like himself? Do men prefer women who are masculine to those who are feminine, or womanly, in their habits and manners?

It may be replied that there are a class of men who do. Those who want their wives and daughters to work and earn for them, value them, not in proportion as they are modest, timid and gentle, but in proportion as they are strong and willing to use their strength for the common benefit. But among this class there need be no clamor for woman's rights; the women have an undisputed right to do everything that is coarse and unwomanly. It is not necessary to go back to the savage state for illustrations of this; a tour among the poorer classes of the peasantry in any country of Europe would furnish abundance. The tourist would readily discover that women may work in the field from sunrise till sunset; that they may go out before their husbands in the morning and remain out after them in the evening; that those who have no husbands may work in the field as long as they are able, side by side with men, and get as much pay as men, when they perform as much labor. But are the women proud of all this? Do they boast of their equality with the men, or have they cause to boast? Do they excite the envy of the wives and daughters of their landlords or employers because the latter are such tyrants that they prefer doing the rougher work themselves. This, perhaps, will serve to explain why it is that the theory of "woman's rights" has so few votaries even in the most romantic countries of Europe.

But the peasant women are not merely allowed the right of doing every sort of work; they are also allowed the right of advising their husbands. Nor is this anything new or exceptional; it is no "modern improvement." Among all the principal races of mankind, "woman's rights" were fully conceded by the most barbarous. It may seem incredible to many that it was the most barbarous who were most

liberal in this respect; but such, nevertheless, is the fact. The ancient Germans* and ancient Gauls† alike engaged in no important enterprise without consulting their wives.‡ There is no part of Guizot's excellent History of Civilization more interesting than that in which he shows, from the testimony of numerous historians, that woman's rights were well understood among our rude ancestors, both Teutonic and Gallic, more than two thousand years ago.§ True, the historian does not call the privileges enjoyed by the ladies of those distant ages "woman's rights." Cæsar and Tacitus, as well as Guizot, were evidently of opinion that the women of those times would have been much better off had their "rights" been somewhat more limited than they were; and there is good reason to believe that the women themselves, accustomed as they were to compete with men, even in the field of battle, would willingly have surrendered several of their "rights"|| in exchange for just such tyrannical treatment as their fair posterity are so solemnly and vehemently protesting against at the present day.

But this is not the only evidence of the short-sightedness of our woman's rights advocates. They would have the world believe that they are in advance of the age, but we can assure them that only the credulous and silly part of the world believe any such thing. It is idle to deny that the intelligent and thoughtful regard them, at best, very much in the

* The ancient Germans regarded woman as something holy and inspired, and consulted her accordingly as an oracle that seldom, if ever, was mistaken in regard to the future. We quote the words of Tacitus: "Inesse quinetiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant."—*De Moribus Germanorum*, c. 8.

† See Cæsar *De Bello Gal.* i. vi., c. xix., *et seq.*

‡ When Hannibal complained that the Gauls had done wrong to his countrymen, they replied that if the Carthaginians felt themselves aggrieved they must present their case to the Gallic women:

"Les Gaulois consultaient les femmes dans les affaires importantes; ils convinrent avec Annibal que si les Carthaginois avaient à se plaindre des Gaulois, ils porteraient leurs plaintes devant les femmes gauloises, qui en seraient juges."—*Mém. de l'Académie, des Inscriptions*, t. xxiv., p. 374; *Mémoire de l'abbé Fénélon*.

It is well known that even the North American Indians regularly and carefully consulted their wives.

"Les Hurons, en particulier, consultent soigneusement les femmes."—Charlevoix, *Hist. du Canada*, pp. 267, 269, 287.

§ *Hist. de la Civ. en France*, vol. i., pp. 215-225.

|| The most degraded tribe of the Siberian women enjoyed woman's rights to

light of the innocent frogs who were so clamorous in their demands for a king from Jupiter. We have shown that nowhere are the sexes more on an equality than among the rudest classes, and that it has always been so. If, instead of "equality," we use the term "liberty," there will be no change in the circumstances, since no women can be said to enjoy more liberty than those whose "inalienable right" it is to roam the forest. But this is equally true of man. If any mortal may be said to be entirely free it is the savage in his hunting grounds, armed with his bow and arrow; nor can he cease to be a savage without surrendering a portion of that freedom!

When man attains to civilization he submits to a certain restraint on his liberty, in order that he may be protected by the state. Woman surrenders a portion of her liberty to man precisely on the same principle; as a return for the protection and support which she receives from him she renders him obedience, and does what she can to contribute to his happiness. At least, she is expected to do those things. Seeing that her husband does not wish her to do men's work, or to place herself in a position in which her virtue would be in danger, she thinks it her duty to abstain, if only to please him. This is what she is supposed to do in a well-ordered community; and most cheerfully do we admit that in general the supposition is a correct one. Nor do we think there are any women more obedient, more gentle, or more faithful, than those of our own country; none are less disposed to oppose, set at defiance, or otherwise annoy their husbands. Although there are more advocates of woman's rights among the ladies of the United States than among those of any other country, it is true, at the same time, that there are fewer Xantippes or disagreeable wives; and we believe that if the matter were duly investigated, it would be ascertained that three-fourths of the latter class, if not a still

the fullest extent, when their inhospitable country was first explored by civilized men. They fought in battle habitually with their husbands; but the historian tells us that they were not the less maltreated on this account:

"Les femmes tunguses, en Sibérie, vont aussi à la guerre avec leurs maris; elles n'en sont pas moins maltraitées."—Meiners, *Hist. du Sexe Féminin, en allemand*, t. I., pp. 18-19.

larger proportion, are to be found among the advocates of woman's rights. Assuming this to be the fact, the question would arise, whether it would not be better, upon the whole, that our American Xantippes had pursued the course of their ancient prototype than that they do pursue. It seems that even the wife of Socrates attended pretty carefully to her domestic duties. It does not appear from the account of either Plato or Xenophon that she neglected her children, or required the philosopher to do the nursing or the dish washing. If she sometimes gave him a bath when he did not wish it, and was not particular whether it was clean or otherwise, we have the best evidence that she was attached to him nevertheless. Her deep grief at his condemnation showed that, no matter what she said or did to her husband, she was still a true woman at heart, and an affectionate wife.

Be this as it may, it is very generally believed among the most sensible and most intelligent classes of mankind, that women who are fond of hearing themselves speak in public, anxious to see their names in the newspapers, as reformers, and ever ready to inveigh against man as a tyrant, rarely, if ever, make good wives. Indeed it would seem that a large portion of our young men have adopted this theory; we prefer to arrive at this conclusion, rather than to say that there are so many old maids and neglected young widows among the women's rights sisterhood, only because they have fewer personal attractions than the sex in general, and fewer womanly qualities. It is probably nearer the truth to attribute the state of things alluded to, partly to one cause and partly to another: for several honest young men, who do not seem at all wanting in courage, have assured us that they would rather remain single for ever, than marry a peripatetic female reformer, but especially a reformer of the woman's rights type.

It is true that there are many young men, and old men, too, who regard the matter in a different light; but they form but a very small minority. This is fortunate, because it is this class — sometimes called the Miss Nancy class — that urge the women to forget that they are such. If there are more woman's rights women in the United States than in any other

country equally enlightened, it is chiefly, if not solely, because we have more of this species of men in proportion to our population. The excess is the result of causes which might be easily pointed out; but it will be sufficient for our present purpose to remark, in general terms, that our climate and mode of life have a great deal to do with that phenomenon.

We are very unwilling to give any needless pain to either the men or the women engaged in the woman's rights movement, much as we dislike it; but, happily, it so happens that the feelings of neither are very sensitive; if the blush of modesty or delicacy ever mantles the cheek of either, after they have devoted a certain time to the cause, we think it is very seldom; and if anything like a blush does appear, we think its genuineness may be doubted.

Here we are reminded of certain facts which science has fully demonstrated. It is sometimes remarked, in jest, that this or that individual, in female garments, is but half a female; and, for a similar reason, it is remarked that this or that individual, in male garments, is but half a male—that he is half, or more than half, a female! In general the observation merely creates a smile; although it is a smile of assent to the justice of the satire, in a metaphorical sense, not one out of five hundred having the least idea that the fact may be literally true.

Now, if women are like men, or men like women, why should we blame either if it is the result of malformation, or of a *lusus nature*? It would be much more rational, as well as more charitable, to commiserate their condition. If there are any who think that we merely jest in attempting to account for some of the woman's rights phenomena in this way, they can easily ascertain for themselves that the assertion we make on the subject is substantially correct.

From the most remote antiquity up to the middle of the eighteenth century, no doubt was entertained as to the reality of hermaphroditism; it was universally admitted, at least among scientific men, that in many instances both sexes were combined, in different proportions, in one individual. Not only had all naturalists and physicians, who had written treatises on man, spoken of it as an incontestible fact, but the

most eminent artists represented it both in painting and sculpture. But in the earlier part of last century, all opinions which seemed in conflict with the general course of nature, were regarded as superstitious or fabulous; and, accordingly, hermaphroditism was denied or declared doubtful. But modern science has demonstrated, that, as in numerous similar instances, the ancients were right, after all. Several works have been written on the subject within the present century; but we need only mention that of Geoffrey Saint-Hilaire.* None who examine this remarkable and learned work will entertain any doubt on the subject. Those who may not be able to procure the treatise itself, as it is scarce in this country, may find an analysis of the part of it bearing on our present subject, in the supplement to the *Encyclopédie Moderne*, vol. v., article "Hermaphroditisme."

Saint-Hilaire fully describes the different kinds of hermaphroditism, designating them respectively, as "masculine," "feminine," "neuter," and "mixed;" and illustrating them with plates. Nor does the philosopher overlook the moral and intellectual characteristics of each variety. Even the peculiarities of the voice and gestures are clearly indicated. He shows that if many ancient authors spoke of women *who became men*, as instances of the marvellous, they did not do so either through ignorance, or a disposition to impose on the credulity of their readers.

Among the ancients the phenomenon under consideration was regarded as foreboding some terrible calamity in the family to which the individual exhibiting it belonged; and it may be doubted whether the moderns should not regard it in the same light, though for different reasons. Be this as it may, the great anatomists of our day regard it as a "*simple anomalie, arrête de développement*," &c. Sometimes the complications are such that it is impossible to determine whether the individual, in this condition, be male, or female. † For the proofs of this we

* *Histoire générale et particulière des anomalies de l'organisation chez l'homme et chez les animaux*, 2 vol. in 8vo, 1856; t. ii. *des Hermaphrodismes*.

† L'hermaphroditisme neutre comprend les cas dans lesquels les parties sexuelles ont une caractéristique tellement ambiguë qu'il est impossible de distinguer si elles sont mâles ou femelles, en sorte qu'il paraît évident que l'individu qui les possède n'appartient à aucun sexe.—*Compté de l'Ency. Mod.*, tome v., p. 411.

must refer to the treatises alluded to — especially to that of M. St-Hilaire — for we wish to abstain carefully from every remark and allusion that might have a prurient tendency, and confine ourselves exclusively to such of the scientific facts as are necessary to afford at least a reasonable clue as to what the real difficulty is, in certain cases, altogether independently of styles of garments.

In the mixed species other phenomena present themselves — phenomena which also extend to the voice, gestures, habits, &c. Again, to all external appearance, one may seem to be a man, or a woman, except so far as the habits or the conduct may excite suspicion, as intimated; and yet the experienced and skilful anatomist may be able to demonstrate that the fact is but partially true at best.* These facts are now so fully recognized, that they have been embodied in the medical jurisprudence of all the enlightened nations of Europe, so that it is by no means a rare occurrence for the physician to be called into court to tell, on his oath, if he can, what is the sex of a particular individual!†

Now, let the reader reflect for a moment, and try to remember what are the general characteristics of both the ladies and gentlemen who are the most active and zealous advocates of "woman's rights." It is not sufficient to examine those who go about from town to town to attend meetings, get up resolutions, and deliver speeches, although we humbly think that such examinations, occasionally made, under proper auspices, by medical men of acknowledged skill, virtue, and discretion, would prove the best remedy for those revolutionary hysterics yet applied. It is, however, also necessary to see who are the chief

* "L'hermaphrodisme *mixte*, au contraire, mériterélement ce nom. Un individu sera mixte s'il présente réunis des organes mâles et des organes femelles, non pas réunis chacun au complet, mais partiellement, quelques organes mâles remplaçant quelques organes femelles, et réciproquement."

† L'hermaphrodisme donne lieu à des questions de médecine légale fort délicates et que nous ne pouvons qu'indiquer; c'est aux médecins appelés par les tribunaux à rechercher, autant que cela est possible, sur un individu vivant les caractères propres à déterminer le sexe. Toutefois nous devons dire, pour la décharge des médecins appelés à résoudre ces questions, qu'il y a des difficultés considérables et quelquefois insurmontables à préciser le sexe; car rien à l'extérieur ne peut faire deviner l'état des organes intérieurs. Ainsi, lorsqu'à un appareil génital féminin complet s'ajoutent à l'intérieur quelques organes mâles, le médecin ne saurait reconnaître l'existence de ces derniers; la difficulté est encore plus grande quand l'individu est neutre. — *Complément de l'Encyc. Mod.* t. v., p. 411.

aiders and abettors of the movement among the members of the press, the clergy, the medical faculty, the bar. We think that if the investigation be impartially made, and extended in this manner, it will be found, in nine cases out of ten, that those who are in favor of woman's rights, are, or have been, equally in favor of various other visionary projects. Those who consult the work of Sainte-Hilaire will see that the sex of an individual may be even doubtful; and yet he or she may possess a certain kind of talent, especially a talent for speech-making, and making a general noise in the world; nature being disposed to make amends in this way for her carelessness in arranging, or rather disarranging, certain details. Some may think that because they have a family they are entitled to exemption from examinations of this kind; but although such a plea would seem a very plausible one, science has proved, in a hundred instances, as the reader may ascertain, that it is by no means conclusive!

If, upon the other hand, we inquire who are opposed to "woman's rights," we shall have to place in that category the greatest women, as well as the greatest men of all ages and countries. The great philosopher, the great poet, the great soldier, the great scientific discoverer, the great jurist, the great divine—those who love woman best and esteem her most—are all equally opposed to woman's rights. In short, those who would be the first to die, if necessary, in defence of woman, would be the last to concede those rights, precisely because they are too precious of her to expose her to what would inevitably degrade her, even though no rude or lascivious hand should ever be laid upon her in her competition with men.

It is needless to enter into particulars on this point; the most short sighted can see for themselves, that, in accordance with the scientific facts just glanced at, it is the women who are most like men, and the men who are most like women, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred are advocates of woman's rights. Hence it is that when some of our journalists compare a woman ambitious to vote, to hold political office, and to reform her male neighbors by her public speeches—to a *crowing hen*, he does not merely perpetrate a joke, or indulge in well merited satire; for if the crowing hen were placed in the hands of any competent comparative anatomist, it would be found that if

the poor feathered biped imitated some of the performances of the male of its species, it was not without substantial reason.

But, assuming that anatomy has nothing to do with the matter—an assumption which is certainly not justified by the facts—it requires but very little research and reflection to ascertain that the woman's rights doctrines confer no credit on either the men or the women who advocate them. A great many think that those doctrines have, at least, the merit of novelty; but we will show that such is not the case. Thus, for example, there is not a single "right" claimed at the present day by the most unblushing of our fair orators, but was claimed and enjoyed by the women of Sparta, nearly three thousand years ago.

Now let us pause for a moment, and learn what we can from this fact, for it is fully attested by the most reliable historians. Those authors tell us what the Spartan women were before and after those "rights" were conceded to them. They tell us that before they had any more rights than the women of other countries, they were equally distinguished for their industry and virtue; nor were there any more beautiful women of their time. In short, they were just such as those daughters of America are now, who worthily maintain the national character of the sex; for we hold that, if the woman's rights advocates be regarded as exceptions—what they really are—there are no women that possess the best and noblest characteristics of the sex, in a higher degree than our own. But what was the character of the Spartan women, after they had obtained their rights? what did they gain by their emancipation from the tyranny of man? It matters little which of the historians who relate the facts we consult; all bear testimony to the degradation brought on those excellent women by that very "equality before the laws" which is now so clamorously demanded by the advocates of woman's rights. The Spartan women had been at least as good as the women of any of the other Grecian states before they obtained their rights in the manner indicated; and so early as the time of Homer, the Grecian women had manners and customs which would do no discredit to the most refined and most virtuous ladies of our own time. The Homeric ladies wanted no rights; they enjoyed all they desired, and were

content; and Thucydides assures us* that the modesty and delicacy so admirably and fully portrayed by the poet had subsisted in Greece for ages. Homer represents no indecent scenes in the relations of the sexes; on the contrary, the state of manners which he describes has never been surpassed. Andromache, Nausicæ, and Penelopé were but types of the women of the better class; yet they are regarded as models by the best modern and christian authorities. Certainly no women could be more feminine or more modest. Full of solicitude as Andromache is for the safety of Hector, in no instance does she attempt to go to see him without being accompanied by her maid; and never does her husband come home, but he finds her surrounded by her maids. Even Helen is everywhere represented by Homer as the victim of violence; nowhere as a depraved or faithless woman; and she never alludes to her abduction herself, but with expressions of deep regret and shame, and often bitter tears. Much as the suitors of Penelopé are condemned in the *Odyssey*, they make no indecent proposals to the wife of Ulysses; they merely urge her to marry; and they do so solely on the ground that her husband is dead, and that there is no hope of his return. The very fact that all the states of Greece combined to make war upon Troy, to avenge the abduction of Helen, and compel her return, shows, at once, the high respect in which woman was held, and the odium with which "free love" was regarded.

The best authority on the manners and customs of the Spartans is Plutarch; indeed there is no better authority on any historical or biographical subject which he has treated. Plutarch agrees with all other ancient authors as to the exemplary character of the Spartan women before they got too many rights; and he tells us plainly how they lost this character. "They had, indeed," he says, "assumed great liberty and power on account of the frequent expeditions of their husbands, during which they were sole mistresses at home, and so gained undue influence and improper titles."† Aristotle informs us that when the women, once so exemplary that they were eagerly sought in marriage by the young men of all the neighboring nations, found themselves in the possession of

* Lib. 1. c. 3.

† Plut., in *Lycurgus*.

their rights, even Lycurgus had to desist from the effort of bringing them under *sober rules*.^{*} We have interesting evidence, in various forms, that they exercised quite as much power in the time of Pericles, as our own woman's rights ladies so loudly and persistently demand at the present day. Thus the historian informs us, that on Gorgo, the wife of Leonidas, being asked by a woman of another country how it was that those of Sparta were the only women in the world that ruled the men, her answer was: "*We are the only women that bring forth men.*"[†]

It is to this ascendancy, on the part of the women, that the Stagirite alludes, when he remarks that the surest sign of the decline of a nation is, to find its women ruling the men. But let us glance at some of the means by which this state of things was produced in Lacedæmon. Thus, for example, we are informed that "in order to take away the excessive tenderness and delicacy of the sex, the consequence of a recluse life, the virgins were accustomed to be seen occasionally *naked*, as well as the young men, and to dance and sing in their presence on certain festivals."[‡]

Lest it might not be sufficient for the young virgins to appear naked among the naked young men, and dance and sing in their company, the former were also encouraged to "indulge in a little raillery upon those that had misbehaved themselves."[§] In short, both young and old of the ruder sex had to submit with as good a grace as they could to whatever treatment the ladies thought proper to give them.

But be it remembered that we cannot blame the Spartans for having deliberately agreed to their own degradation; that the "revolution" had been accomplished during their absence, when there were none to oppose the revolutionists but the non-combatants—all the varieties of the Miss Nancy fraternity—who, for various reasons, were as anxious for the change as the women themselves. Some will say, that at all events, the Spartan women must have gained courage in this manner, according as they lost the more feminine virtues; and that the service they must have rendered the state, in time of war, should be taken into account. To the casual observer

^{*} *Politics*, lib. ii., c. ix.

[†] *Plut.*, in *Lycurg.*

[‡] *Ib.*

[§] *Ib.*

this may seem plausible ; but we have the most satisfactory testimony that this is the best that could be said in its favor. It will be admitted that Aristotle is good authority on the subject ; and what does he tell us ?—"And as this boldness of the women *can be of no avail in any matters of daily life*, if it was ever so, it must be in war; *but we find that the Lacedæmonian women were of the greatest disservice in this respect*, as was proved at the time of the Theban invasion, when *they were of no use at all, as they are in other cities, but made more disturbance than even the enemy.*"*

There is no modern nation, need we say, in which women are treated with more deference than in the United States ; not only are all our women "ladies," but a large proportion of our men are quite willing even to wash the dishes for them. Yet a great deal of progress, if such it may be called, has yet to be made before our people look upon their wives and sweethearts as such superior beings as the Spartan women became at one time in the eyes of the Spartan men. It was the latter who were in need of rights in Lacedæmon ; only those who behaved themselves satisfactorily were allowed to keep company with the female members even of their own household. Even when a man got married, he could only expect to enjoy the society of his wife on particular occasions. Thus, we are told, that when the bridegroom staid a short time in his wife's apartment, on the night of his marriage, "*he modestly retired to his usual apartment, to sleep with the other young men, and observed the same conduct afterwards*, spending the day with his companions and reposing with them at night, not even visiting his bride but with great caution and *apprehension of being discovered* by the rest of the family."† Thus it was the men who were supposed to have modesty in the model republic of the ancient world, and not the women, after the latter had obtained their rights ! It may be said that this timidity, or high deference, on the part of the men, is not incompatible with delicacy or virtue, on the part of the women, although the naked exhibitions alluded to above may justify some

* Aristotle's *Politics*, b. ii., c. ix. p. 65.

† Plut. in *Lycurg.*

suspicion in that respect. But the historian leaves us in no doubt; we are at no loss to understand what female equality, or rather female preponderance, meant. We have already alluded to the failure of Lycurgus, according to Aristotle, to bring the Spartan women under "sober rule." But the law-giver was also a philosopher. Seeing that the men were willing to be ruled by the women, when they got used to the yoke, he thought it well to have the latter on his side; he suggested that it would be well to extend their rights. Accordingly, we are told that "he laughed at those who revenge with wars and bloodshed the communication of married woman's favors; and *allowed* that if a man in years should have a young wife, he might introduce to her some handsome and honest young man whom he most approved of, and when he had a child of this generous race, bring it up as his own," &c.*

It seems the "emancipated" ladies considered this excellent logic; the men may not have liked it so well, even in their degenerate state, but what could poor fellows do but submit, who dare not be seen approach their wives' apartments until they were sent for, or allowed permits, like servants! It was some consolation to the men, if they sometimes felt a little uncomfortable under this regulation, that they had the assurance of their great law-giver that the Spartan race would be vastly improved by it.

What a tremendous excitement has been created recently throughout Europe and America, even by the unfounded accusation of incest against the illustrious dead! But the model republic whose manners and customs our women's rights advocates would have us imitate, legalized that very crime. If a Spartan lady of this "enlightened" period had a son and daughter that happened to like each other, both the law and public opinion allowed them to get married.† Now let the reader bear in mind the reply of the modest Gorgo, when asked how it was that those of Lacedæmon were the only women in the world that ruled the men. What the good lady meant was, that because her fellow-countrywomen

* Plutarch in *Lycurgus*.

† See *Strabo*, Lib. x. See, also, Montesquieu *Esprit des Lois*, Liv. v., c. v.

enjoyed their rights in full, because they could form their own "affinities," because they could go about day and night, to teach the men, and take home with them any they happened to fancy, their offspring could not be otherwise than superior specimens of mankind. We may ask, in passing, has no such argument as this been adduced by our own woman's rights advocates? Do we hear nothing about "the rights of maternity?" Has no intimation been given by our peripatetic female orators and reformers as to the fine, strapping fellows all our young men would prove in due time, if the existing superstition and tyranny which restrain enlightened ladies from choosing their "affinities" were only set aside as they should?

None acquainted with the subject will deny that the whole matter was fully tested by the Spartans; nowhere else has the experiment been made on so large a scale. But how did the race exhibit improvement or superiority? Let the story of the Helots, even as told by their apologists, answer the question. Nothing is clearer than that in proportion as the women became licentious in the exercise of their "inalienable rights," the men became cruel and bloodthirsty. "The governors of the youth," says Plutarch, "ordered the shrewdest of them, from time to time, to disperse themselves in the country, provided only with daggers and some necessary provisions. In the day time they *hid themselves*, and rested in the most private places they could find, but at night they sallied out into the roads and *killed all the Helots they could meet with*."*

Still darker is the picture drawn by Thucydides, and it is fully sustained in its worst features by the testimony of Aristotle. Not content with murdering their wretched, naked slaves in detail, in the manner indicated, Thucydides tells us that the Spartans selected such of the Helots as were distinguished for their courage, pretending that they wished to reward them. Under this pretext, they declared about two thousand free, crowned them with garlands, and conducted them to the temples of the gods. All were slaughtered in cold blood—not one was allowed to escape.

* Loc. cit.

Such was the improved race—such the model republic—whose example our advocates of women's rights and “free love” would fain have the modern world imitate!

If we turn to ancient Rome, we shall find the same causes producing the same results. In the time of the republic, the Roman women were celebrated for their truly feminine qualities, for their modesty and their virtue. The Cornelias and Cordelias were but types of the Roman matrons of their time. There is abundant evidence of this in the pages of both historians and satirists. Livy, especially, fully describes the women of the republic; and Tacitus, Juvenal and Horace describe them in contrast with the women who became “emancipated from the tyranny of men.” Law after law was passed for their gratification, always at the instance of men who wanted to raise themselves to power by their influence, or by men who were nearly half women themselves. It was these two classes who were always their allies in their “aspirations for liberty;” and nothing is more plainly demonstrated than that just in proportion as they were successful, did the women of Rome become infamous. In order to determine the morals of a people from their historians, it is necessary to examine their whole works; but it is different with the satirists. The latter direct their attention to particular vices which they think are most reprehensible, or most dangerous to the public welfare. That this is the course pursued by Juvenal is universally admitted; no other satirist, of ancient or modern times, combined in a higher degree the two essential qualities of honesty and fearlessness. Now let us hear a word or two of what he has to say in regard to his countrywomen, bearing in mind, in justice to his memory, that it is for no lack of respect or love for woman, that he utters those terrible denunciations against her; on the contrary, he does so because he is grieved at heart to see her so degraded, and wishes to warn posterity against the causes which produced that degradation. Juvenal, as well as Tacitus, shows that as long as the women attended to their domestic duties, and abstained from competing with men, they had no superiors anywhere. Alluding to the character of the women before their “rights” were acknowledged, or

even thought of, the satirist proceeds: "Nor did hard toil and short nights' rest, and hands galled and hardened with the Tuscan fleece, and Hanibal close to the city, and their husbands mounting guard at the Colline tower, suffer their lowly roofs to be contaminated with vice.* Upon the other hand, he places, in relief, the cause of the change: "What modesty," he asks, "can a woman show that wears a helmet, and *eschews her sex, and delights in feats of strength?*"† Is this different in the nineteenth century? Can modesty or delicacy be expected from such modern ladies? The Roman dames, also, sometimes left their husbands to mind the babies, wash the dishes, etc. "But let her rather be musical," says the satirist, "*than fly through the whole city with bold bearing, and encounter the assemblies of men,*" etc.‡ Sometimes they chose their own "affinities" openly, and travelled about with them. "Hippia, though wife to a senator, accompanied a gladiator to Pharos, and the Nile, and the infamous walls of Lagos."§ So licentious did the women become before very long after they obtained their "rights," that comparatively few men had the courage to marry at all. This is illustrated by the satirist but too faithfully. Purporting to address a friend, who is bold enough to venture, he proceeds: "Fall prostrate at the threshold of Tarpeian Jove, and sacrifice to Juno a heifer with *gilded horns*, if you have the rare good fortune to find a matron with unsullied chastity. * * * Is one husband enough for Iberena? Sooner will you prevail on her to be content with one eye."||

But our female reformers will tell us that those whom we pretend to regard as their prototypes, were but ignorant, stupid creatures, who had no idea of colleges, seminaries, institutes, or even schools. But let us hear Juvenal, who was

* Sat. vi.

† Quem præstare potest mulier galeata pudorem.

Quæ fugit a sexu? —v. 252.

‡ Sed cantet potius, puam totam pervolet urbem

Audax, et coetus possit quam ferre virorum. —v. 398.

§ Nupta Senatori comitata est Hippia Ludium

Ad Pharon, et Nilum, famosæque moenia Lagi. —v. 82.

|| Delicias hominis! Tarpeium limen adora

Pronus, et auratam Juuoni caede iuvencam,

Si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici. —Sat. vi., v. 47-49.

a scholar and a philosopher, as well as a poet and satirist. The "girl of the period" opens her mouth, the incessant cruelties of men are her topic, there is nothing can resist her eloquence and learning; "the grammarians yield; rhetoricians are confuted; the whole company is silenced; neither lawyer nor crier can put in a word, not even another woman. Such a torrent of words pours forth you would say so many basons or bells were being struck at once. Henceforth let no one trouble *trumpets or brazen vessels*; she will be able singly to *relieve the moon when suffering an eclipse*."

We think we have now fully shown what woman's rights really mean. If we turn to the great European nations of the present day we shall find that it is the women who enjoy most "rights" that have the most doubtful reputation at home as well as abroad. It is certain that no country in the world has presented nobler specimens of womanhood than France; every intelligent person can recall the names of French ladies, who, in all the relations of life, have proved a credit to their sex. But if the history of these exemplary ladies be examined, it will be found that they were trained in a very different manner from the generality of their countrywomen. They did not get, nor did they give themselves, the habit of running about like men. Thus it is, that while Frenchwomen in general have everywhere the name of being lax in their morals, there are no more excellent teachers of youth, no more faithful and devoted wives, no more affectionate daughters, no kinder mothers than are to be found among the women of France. But although the ladies of France enjoy more rights than those of any other enlightened nation of Europe, not excepting those of England, they certainly do not enjoy as many rights as the ladies of America. Both the laws and public opinion favor the latter vastly more. In illustration of this we need only say that in every particular of any importance, Frenchwomen must render obedience to their husbands; if they refuse to do so, they forfeit their protection. A French lady cannot even accept a donation or a legacy without the authority of her husband.* Yet, as we have said, they have more liberty than the women of any

* See articles 905 and 934 of the *Civil Code*.

other European country; at the same time, it is not pretended that they are equal to the men, for all, save our woman's rights advocates, admit that this would be impossible, and contrary to nature. "*L'égalité rigoureuse n'existe pas, il est vrai, entre l'homme et la femme,*" says an eminent French jurist, "*mais cette égalité est impossible elle n'est ni dans la nature, ni dans la destination sociale de l'homme, et de la femme.*"

In England, as all know, the women live much more private than they do in France; accordingly it is admitted by the most patriotic French authors that Englishwomen are more modest than their own countrywomen.* It is not because the women of England are naturally more virtuous, or more modest than those of France; it would be a slander on a great nation to assert any such thing. No doubt climate has some agency in producing the difference; but, beyond all question, the chief, if not the only cause is, that, while the women of France are pretty nearly "emancipated from the tyranny of man," the women of England are still more or less subject to that tyranny. It may be that it is because they do not know better that they seem to bear their yoke with so much resignation, and even apparent comfort. The law which allowed an Englishman to give his wife "moderate correction,"† with certain weapons,‡ is still on the statute-book, though now, like many another law equally rude, it is a dead letter. But even at the present day, a husband is empowered to lock up his better half in some safe room, if she misbehaves, and keep her there on bread and water until she exhibits becoming penitence.§ But the great English jurist, in reviewing the whole subject, fully corroborates the views of all other great thinkers of ancient and modern times. He shows that the laws constituting the "disabilities" under which English women labor are intended for their protection and benefit; and that they do protect and benefit them, he thinks sufficiently obvious. "So great a favorite," Blackstone says, "is the female sex of the laws of England."

* As an instance, see Montesquieu, *Esprit des Loix*, liv. xiv. c. xxvii.

† *Modicam castigationem adhibere.* ‡ *Flagellis et fustibus acriter verberare solum.*

§ *Vide Blackstone's Com., B. I. II.*

No intelligent, sensible person need be informed that we are not actuated in writing this article, by any hostility to the sex. Nor do we oppose their competing with men in the highways and byways of the world, on the ground of their being inferior to men either intellectually or morally; indeed we have ever held that women are much better, morally, than men. They are more honest and more truthful, as well as more virtuous, and less disposed to the commission of crime. As to our depreciating their intellectual capacities, we think it will be admitted that we have always pursued the opposite course. And as a proof of our sincerity we could point to articles in different numbers of our journal, contributed by ladies, which are among the most brilliant contributions we have received; and their authors would bear us testimony that we did not value them anything the less, pecuniarily or otherwise, for their being the productions of women. It is precisely, then, because we think highly of the sex in every respect, that we are opposed to those habits and practices whose inevitable tendency is to degrade them.

Even the woman's rights advocates admit that women are not as strong, physically, as men; but we have shown that there are much more cogent reasons than this, why ladies who respect themselves, or their families, should attend to their domestic affairs as their mothers and grandmothers had done before them, and leave the voting, speech-making, office-holding, fighting, gambling, &c., to their husbands, brothers, and fathers.

Those who have a taste for intellectual pursuits, have ample opportunities for indulging it without any detriment to those qualities for which they are most esteemed and admired by the best of men — indeed by all men worthy of the name. It has afforded us pleasure, on many occasions, to remind our readers, in these pages and elsewhere, that there are no better teachers than ladies; it must be admitted that in this pursuit, at least, they are quite equal, if not superior to men. In literature, art, and science, numerous ladies have distinguished themselves without in the least compromising their character for modesty or delicacy. In short, there is no intellectual pursuit to which they can devote themselves in

private, or without having to work surrounded by men, to which they may not devote themselves, and with good prospect of success. But, whatever the pursuit may be—let it be intellectual or physical—in which the women have to be associated with the men, indiscriminately, no matter how exemplary may be the conduct of the latter, the former must necessarily deteriorate in their best womanly qualities.

We cannot, therefore, agree with those who think the medical profession a suitable one for woman, although we readily admit that no profession is more honorable or more useful. Altogether, independently of the incalculable benefit they render mankind in alleviating their sufferings, they have always occupied a high rank in the moral scale. But precisely because this is the fact there is no sufficient reason why a lady should endanger her virtue by attempting to become a physician; for, disguise it as we may, there is danger in it. And surely those who claim to be equal to men, especially in the exercise of the reasoning faculty, and the government of their passions, should not pretend, if they lose their virtue, to throw all the blame upon the men! This would be illogical and somewhat inconsistent, to say the least; and the day will come when the public will regard the matter in the same light, as it has long been generally regarded in Europe even in those instances in which the ladies losing their virtue have never pretended to be equal to men.

Be this as it may, most cheerfully do we admit that, far from being an evil, it were a positive good that women could be attended in all their diseases by learned, skilful, experienced and *modest* female physicians. But they could not; it is utterly impossible! How are the learning, experience and skill to be obtained? Can ladies, young or old, habitually attend clinical lectures with men—lectures delivered and illustrated by men necessarily in the plainest and most graphic language—and retain the natural delicacy and modesty of the sex? Who that has ever heard the demonstrator of anatomy address his pupils a half dozen times with the naked human body in view, would believe such a thing possible?

Be it remembered that there is nothing liable to disease

which the student of medicine must not see. There is nothing which he must not examine—nothing which must not be fully described to him. Can any modest lady pass through such an ordeal, again and again, day after day, in the presence of men, without feeling that if she is not ashamed, *she ought to be*? Nay, if some young men so far forget themselves as to cry “shame” because she persists in witnessing such scenes, and listening to such descriptions and explanations, can she blame them much, on reflection, although all must admit that their conduct is ungentlemanly? It might be still worse if they suggested in her presence that she ought to be subject to an anatomical examination herself, in accordance with the theories of St. Hilaire and other medical philosophers. Then, if she does not expose herself in this manner, she cannot become a learned and skilful physician, and if she is not learned and skilful, or either, how can women more than men be expected to employ her and confide in her diagnosis or prognosis?

Finally, suppose her superior skill is universally recognized, will she be ready to go out at any hour, day or night, she is called, and willing to enter any place in which a sufferer may need her aid? If she is married, will her husband accompany her at night, or will she prefer to go without him, since his presence might suggest that, after all, there are some “rights” which she has not yet obtained? In short, view the matter as we will, it is surrounded with difficulties; it is in open conflict with modesty and delicacy. No doubt much good will be done by our female physicians; but when the day of reckoning comes—when the question has been fully tested—we are convinced that the mischief resulting from the same will be vastly more.

But undoubtedly it is themselves and their friends, not their patients, our female doctors will injure most. We can assure them that no men will fancy them, except, perhaps, the class alluded to above, physiologically, or their brethren of the “free love” school; and even these, however liberal they are in general in conceding rights, are not always to be relied upon. But if our female doctors would become teachers, or authors, then, if it

were not their own fault, they might claim the esteem of the everest moralist, as well as the love of the most fastidious admirers of those qualities, which, when refined by culture and intelligence, are the only true and lasting ornaments of the sex.

Since the above article was put in type, a tragedy has occurred to which we may allude, briefly, as affording a startling, if not new illustration of the most prominent views we have put forward in that paper. The only novelty we can see in the McFarland-Richardson affair, is the extraordinary course pursued by certain ministers of the gospel. Nor can we pretend that we are surprised at even this. That it is shameful, is but too true; it should render its authors infamous in the eyes of every decent man and woman; and yet we cannot say that we expected much better from Mr. Beecher. That gentleman may not, hitherto, have expressly justified adultery and made marriage a mockery; but has he not for years been the zealous aider and abettor, directly or indirectly, of every "ism" whose obvious tendency is to strike at the foundation of the social system?

It affords us pleasure to place on record the fact, that, with one or two exceptions, all our journals that are possessed of any influence have denounced each of the principal actors in the disgraceful scenes alluded to, as their outrageous conduct deserved. But they will have to denounce many more, and for conduct still worse, if possible, if women's rights triumph; let those who doubt this interrogate Lysurgus and Plutarch, Tacitus, and Juvenal, for, thanks to the refining and elevating influence of christianity, no modern historian or satirist has yet witnessed the full development of woman's rights, as taught at the present day by various female associations, parliaments, &c., &c.

ART. V.—1. *A Lytell Geste of Robin Hode, with other ancient and modern ballads and songs, relating to this celebrated yeoman.* By JOHN MATTHEW GUTCH, F. S. A. In 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1847.

2. *Robin Hood : a collection of all the ancient Poems, Songs, and Ballads now extant relative to that celebrated outlaw ; to which are prefixed Historical Anecdotes of his Life.* By JOSEPH RITSON, Esq. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1832.
3. *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands.* Par AUGUSTIN THIERRY. Paris, 1851.
4. *Scotichronicon.* IOANNIS FARDUN. Ed. Goodall, folio, Edinburgh. 1759.

THE poems, songs, histories, and essays relating to Robin Hood, the celebrated English robber-chief, form quite a literature of their own. We have before us a list of nearly thirty works on the subject ; and there are, perhaps, as many more, the names of which we have not taken down. Many of these profess to give full and authentic particulars of the bold outlaw's life, which are disputed by others as false, or inaccurate. It is amusing to contrast them, and note the various theories which have been started, as to who he was, and when he lived ; and, even, whether there ever was such a person as Robin Hood. There are six of these theories which we propose to discuss in their turn. The first is, that there never was such a man. The second, that he was the outlawed earl of Huntingdon. The third, that he was a yeoman, and not a nobleman. The fourth, that he lived in the time of Richard I. The fifth, that he lived in the time of Edward I. The sixth, that he lived in the time of Edward II. And since all these theories have had, and now have, their supporters, it is evident that a great amount of obscurity hangs over the subject.

The tendency of modern investigation has been to dethrone the old idols of the world, to deprive history of its romance, and to substitute dry matter-of-fact for the poetry of life. This stripping off of the gay and pleasing costume of the popular heroes of our youthful fancies may be right, and even profitable in the long run, since—as Dr. Priestly says—"the cause of truth must at all times be more beneficial to mankind than that of error." But the process is painful, nevertheless ; and we confess that we should be sorry to discover that our prince of outlaws and robbers—*ille famosissimus sicarius*, as Fordun calls him—was nothing but

a myth; that the dear old familiar names of Robin Hood, Little John, Friar Tuck, Maid Marian, Scarlet Much, the miller's son, Will Scathelock, and George-a-Green, never belonged to any beings more substantial than those which "imagination bodies forth." To relieve ourselves from this anxiety it is obviously necessary to investigate the foundations upon which the first of the six theories rests, viz., that Robin Hood never existed; for this conclusion once established, the other five theories fall with it, and "there an end." So ignoble a termination of our inquiries would remind us of the old joke of the seventeen reasons offered by the citizens of Dover for not saluting Charles II., on his landing; the first of them being that they had no guns, whereupon the king dispensed with the remaining sixteen reasons.

The strong, and, indeed, the only valid argument in support of the non-existence theory is, that no contemporary writer mentions Robin Hood. One of the earliest notices yet discovered of him, occurs in John Fordun's *Scotichronicon*, an imperfect and unfinished history of Scotland, written some time during the latter half of the fourteenth century—probably during the early part of the reign of Richard II., A. D. 1377-84.*

But whence did Fordun obtain his information? He wrote upwards of a century after the battle of Evesham, and he either relied upon tradition, or derived his knowledge from some record, the very name of which has perished. But the text itself gives us the clue to the source from whence Fordun obtained this knowledge of Robin Hood and Little John, viz.: the popular plays, songs, and ballads of the day. A writer in the "Edinburgh Review,"† commenting upon the passage, says: "It is very easy

* This note is as follows: "Hoc in tempore (that is after the battle of Evesham, A. D. 1265, in which prince Edward—afterwards Edward I.—cut to pieces Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and his adherents) de exhereditis et bannitis surrexit et caput erexit ille famosissimus sicarius Robertus Hode et Littill Johanne, cum eorum complicitibus, de quibus stolidum vulgus hianter in comediis et tragediis prurienter festum faciunt, et super ceteras romancias, minos et bardanos cantitares delectantur."—*Scotichronicon*, vol. 2, p. 104.

† Vol. 2., pp. 122-138.

to dovetail the existence and adventures of a hero of the greenwood upon any passage which indicates the existence of a band of outlaws," and maintains that this is what the author of the "*Scotichronicon*" has done. To us it appears far more probable that the popularity of the outlaw had its origin in actual events; and that it became embodied in the form it would naturally take in a rude, unenlightened age, when there was no literature for the mass of the people; viz., in the ballads and plays in which they delighted.

But there is other evidence of the attachment of the yeomanry and peasants of England to their romantic champion, which is scarcely compatible with the theory that some one invented the story of Robin Hood, and that it became so popular, that the people in time came to believe in it as firmly as if it were gospel. This evidence is found in the names of places, and in the local traditions of many counties in England. The writer in the "*Edinburg Review*," before cited, admits this, while sneering at the fact; but he draws from it an inference the reverse of what we do. The list of places named after Robin Hood, or in connection with him, is quite a long one. There is scarcely a county in England, or any class of ancient remains, which, in some place or other, does not claim a kind of relationship to this celebrated hero. Cairns in Blackdown, in Somersetshire, and barrows near Whitby, in Yorkshire, and Ludlow, in Shropshire, are termed Robin Hood's butts. Lofty, natural eminences in Gloucestershire and Derbyshire, are Robin Hood's hills. A huge rock near Matlock, in Derbyshire, is Robin Hood's Tor. Ancient boundary-stones, as in Lincolnshire, are Robin Hood's crosses. A presumed laggan, or rolling-stone, in Yorkshire, is Robin Hood's penny-stone. A fountain near Nottingham, another between Doncaster and Wakefield, and one in Lancashire, are Robin Hood's wells. A cave in Nottinghamshire is his stable. A rude, natural rock in Hope Dale is his chair. A chasm in Chatsworth is his leap. Blackstone Edge, in Lancashire, is his bed. Ancient oaks in various parts of the country are his trees. Plumpton Park, in Cumberland, the forest of Feckenham, in Worcestershire, the deep glades of Sherwood and Barnesdale,

and the innermost recesses of Needwood and Inglewood still resound with his exploits. Loxley, or Locksley, the presumed place of his birth, which is set down by the old writers as in Yorkshire or Nottinghamshire, is also claimed by Warwickshire and Staffordshire.

“Out of monuments, names, words, proverbs, traditions, private records and evidences, fragments of stories, passages of books, and the like, we do save and recover somewhat from the deluge of time,” says Lord Bacon,* and this aphorism is peculiarly applicable to the case of Robin Hood. We find all these testimonies bearing upon it. There are monuments to his memory and that of some of his companions. Gough has given a picture of the stone over the alleged grave of Robin Hood, in Kirklees Park, between Wakefield and Huddersfield, in Yorkshire, (at present the seat of Sir George Armitage, Bart.)† It is a plain stone, with a sort of flowered cross on it, now broken and much defaced. The inscription is illegible; but this stone was probably removed at some remote period from its original place; for the late Sir Samuel Armitage caused the ground underneath it to be dug up, in order to ascertain whether a body had been under it; and it was then found that the ground had never been disturbed. Leland says that “Robin Hood was interred under some trees at a short distance from the house (Kirklees Nunnery, where he died); a stone being placed over his grave with an inscription to his memory: ‘Kirkley monasterium monialium, ubi Ro: Hood nobilis ille exlex sepultus.’”‡

Leland visited the spot, and wrote his description of it in the time of Henry VIII., more than 330 years ago. Dr. Stukeley also, writing at the beginning of the last century, gives an engraving of Kirklees Abbey, *and of the trees among which Robin Hood was buried.*§ The doctor may have been led to believe this as a fact from his partiality for all that concerned the bold outlaw; but, nevertheless, the tradition itself can be traced back several hun-

* *Advancement of Learning*, book ii., vol. ii.

† *Sepulchral Monuments*, p. 108. ‡ *Collectanea*, i., 54. § *Itinerarium Curiosum*.

dred years. Among the personages who figure in the story, is Maid Miriam, a name said to have been given to, or assumed by, the Lady Matilda, daughter of Robert, second Earl Fitzwalter. The legend is, that she fell in love with Robin, and ran away from her father's home to live with him in the greenwood. She is buried at Dunmow priory, in Essex, where may still be seen her monument. It is a mural tomb, shielded by a beautiful screen of dark old oak, which separates the nave from the chancel. On the slab is a reposing figure of the fair Matilda. The head is covered with a woollen coif; the neck is encircled with a collar, and a string of pendants falls upon an embroidered cap; and a rich girdle and long robe, with sleeves close to the wrist, and hands covered with rings, further indicate her rank. Angels were stationed beside her head, and a dog crouched at her feet. But rough hands have marred the tomb; the angels have been rudely broken, though the effigy itself has been spared.*

Robin Hood's companions share their leader's popularity. Little John heads the list as Robin's lieutenant and most devoted follower. William Scadlock, or Scathelock, George-a-Green, Pindar of Wakefield, Scarlet Much, the miller's son, and Friar Tuck, are next in esteem. Then follow Will Stately, Midge, Clifton, William of Goldsborough, Right-hitting Brand, Gilbert with the white hand, Arthur-a-Bland, and Allan-a-Dale, a minstrel. George-a-Green's exploits were very popular; and he figures as the hero of a signpost at many other places besides his native town. A short time since there was one of him at one of the oldest public houses in Gray's Inn lane, London; and the once famous Bagnigge wells, formerly the country resort of the cockneys, but now in the heart of the town, had over an ancient gate, leading into the garden, a sculptured stone with this inscription: "This is Bagnigge house, *near the Pindar-a-Wakefield*."†

A romantic history of George-a-Green was published in 1706. But Little John (whose real name was John the

* Gutch, *A Lytell Geste*, p. 43. † *Ibid*, p. 36.

Naylor), claimed greater celebrity. He stood nearly seven feet high, and was nicknamed "Little" in consequence; and he was not less remarkable for his drollery than his prowess. The cottage in which he died is still shown, at Hathersage, in Sherwood forest; and the churchyard of that town is his reputed burial-place. Two ancient, upright stones mark the spot where his remains reposed, previous to their exhumation many years ago (about the year 1785). A full description of this antique cottage will be found in Hall's "Rambles in the country surrounding the Forest of Sherwood." It is very small, and there is a tradition that his body stretched nearly across the floor when he was dead. His grave was opened by order of Captain James Shuttleworth, and a great thigh-bone was found in it, which measured thirty-two inches in length. This relic was re-interred; but some years afterwards it was re-exumed by a party of "great folk" from Yorkshire, who took it with them to Canon hall, near Barnesley. Up to that time Little John's cap was kept hanging by a chain in the church; but even that they took away—it was a green cloth cap. These doings, even if they *prove* nothing as to the fact of Little John's existence, show how strong is the belief in it at the present day. Mr. Gutch states further, that he was informed by Mr. Hall, that, some years ago, an old house was pulled down at Mansfield, and in its walls was discovered a sort of hiding-place, where the rotten remains of a bow, a green garment, a cap, and something besides were found; and were supposed, from their appearance and locality, to have belonged to one of Robin Hood's band.

Such was the popularity of Little John that both Scotland and Ireland claimed the honor of possessing his grave. Hector Boece (translated by Bellenden*), says: "In Murray land is the kirk of Pette, quhare the bonis of Little Johne remanis in great admiration of pepill. He has bene fourtene fut of hiecht, with square membris effering thairto. Six yeris afore the cuming of this werk to licht, we saw his hanche-bane als mekill as the haill bane of ane man; for

*i. xxxiv.

we schot our arme in the mouth thairof; be quhill appearis how strong and square pepill grew in our regions afore they were effiminat with lust and intemperance of mouth." The Irish say that Little John took refuge in the neighborhood of Dublin, from English oppression. A hillock which, perhaps, was a barrow, that once stood on Astmantowne green, and was termed "Little John's shot," was a lasting evidence of his presence, and of his skill in archery. Some records in the Southwell family, attest that he was publicly executed on Arbor hill, Dublin, for robbery. Absurdly conflicting as these statements are, they still afford evidence of the widespread popularity, or, at all events, notoriety of the individual they relate to.

Now, it is very unlikely that there was no fire to cause all this smoke. It is not sufficient to say that some fortunate ballad-monger, in a happy moment of inspiration, invented the story of Robin Hood and his merry men, and gave them a local habitation as well as a name. The same method of accounting for such widespread fame as connected with a personage only doubtfully known to history, has been resorted to in the case of king Arthur, the ancient British hero, of whom so many traditions remain; but the bulk of evidence is in favor of his having been a real personage, and the localities still pointed out as the scenes of his exploits, are lasting testimonies to the reality of them. Lord Bacon specifies "names and words" as aiding us "to save and recover somewhat from the deluge of time;" and surely an abundance of them has been produced; sufficient to authenticate the belief that Robin Hood and his company were real personages, and performed most of the feats recorded of them. But if mere names are wanting, let us turn to the statement made by Mr. Spencer T. Hall, in his "Forrester's Offering;" himself a native of Sherwood Forest, the scene of Robin's greatest exploits. Commenting on the names of Robin's companions, Little John the Naylor, Much, Scathe-lock, Statley or Stoutly, and others, he says:

"If my reader smiles at the above names, and deem the history fictitious because they are used, I will at once refer him to any churchyard in the Forest, where he will find many similar on the gravestones; and probably, inherited from some of Robin Hood's archers themselves.

Nor am I alone in this opinion; it struck that graphic American writer, Washington Irving, most forcibly, while on a pilgrimage to Newstead Abbey. I have seen a public house in the very heart of the district, with the sign of 'Robin Hood,' and kept by John Little. One of my earliest playfellows rejoiced in the name of Jonas *Archer*; the name of the parish clerk of Kirkby, in Nottinghamshire, is *Shaklock*, and there are many others of the same name in that and the neighboring village of Sutton. *Hordstaff* is the name of the late Squire Chaworth's huntsman, at Annesley Park; and *Beardall* is the name of an innkeeper at Hucknall Torhard; a Mr. *Borman* (there is a name! a sturdy man must the original *bow-breaker* have been!) keeps a public house at Nuncar gate, near Kirkby woodhouse; and similar names, identified with the locality, are as numerous as a parish jury-list!"

From names and words we pass on to "proverbs," the fourth item in Lord Bacon's list of evidences. Mr. Ritson, in his "Historical Anecdotes," appended to his work on Robin Hood, cites several relating to the famous outlaw, and gives the authorities from which he quotes. 1. "Good even, good Robin Hood." This is an allusion to civility extorted by fear. It is preserved by Skelton in his satire on Wolsey, beginning, "Why come ye not to court?" 2. "Many men talk of Robin Hood that were shot in his bow." This saying is found in Fuller's "Worthies." 3. "To overshoot Robin Hood," quoted in Sir Philip Sidney's "Defence of Poesie." 4. "Tales of Robin Hood are good enough for fools." This is found in Camden's "Remains." 5. "To sell Robin Hood's pennyworths." Fuller, in his "Worthies," says that "this was spoken of things sold under half their value, or, if you will, half sold, half given. Robin Hood came lightly by his ware, and lightly parted therewith; so that he could afford the length of his bow for a yard of velvet." 6. "Come, turn about, Robin Hood," implying that to challenge, or defy him, must have been the *ne plus ultra* of courage. It occurs in "Wit and Drollery," 1661. 7. "As crooked as Robin Hood's bow." To these Mr. Gutch adds: 8. "To go round by Robin Hood's barn;" implying the going of a short distance by a circuitous route. 9. "He makes Robin Hood's pennyworths." Of his stolen goods he afforded good pennyworths. 10. "Robin Hood's choice;" this or nothing. And to these may be added the singular saying which was at one time in use in the courts of Westminster:

"Robin Hood in Barnwood stood," which implied a quibble. Shakespeare makes one of the outlaws in the "Two gentlemen of Verona" swear "by the bare scalp of Robin Hood's fat friar;"* and swearing by Robin Hood, or some of his companions, appears to have been a usual practice. Mr. Gutch cites an account of a man going to be hanged, who sang part of an old song of Robin Hood.† At Edinburgh, in the year 1505, one Sandy Steven was convicted of blasphemy, alleging that he would give no more credit to the New Testament than to a tale of Robin Hood, except it were confirmed by the doctors of the church.

After proverbs come traditions, which, as regards Robin Hood, are very numerous. Many of them have been already alluded to, but many more remain. It would take more space than can be allotted to this article, to give them in detail, and the doing so would not help to settle the question as to the reality of the existence of our hero, since the greater number of them are productions of later ages than the latest supposed era of the outlaw; and the exploits therein described in ballad form are probably the inventions of the authors of these poems. Mr. Gutch has presented the entire series, or "cycle," of Robin Hood ballads in his *Lytell Geste*. There are more than sixty of them, all written at different periods, and descriptive of different exploits and adventures of the outlaw and his comrades. Of these the earliest are "A tale of Robin Hood," or "Robin Hode and the Monk," and "Robyn Hode and the Potter." Then comes "The Lytell Geste," the most elaborate and famous of all. Upon these three are founded the subsequent ones. Mr. Wright, the eminent antiquary, in his essay "on the popular cycle of the Robin Hood ballads," gives it as his opinion that the compiler of the legend of the Lytell Geste obtained his materials for each *fyttle* from ballads previously in existence. If this opinion be well founded, we are carried back to an indefinite period of antiquity. The manuscripts of these ballad-romances are to be found in the

* Act 4., se. 1. † *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. iii., p. 154.

‡ Knox's *Historie of the Reformation in Scotland*, p. 368.

public library at Cambridge, England, and Mr. Wright, from internal evidence, conjectures that they may be of a date rather earlier than the reign of Henry V.; but their greatest antiquity must be limited to the 15th century. If, then, the "Lytell Geste" were compiled from other ballads previously in existence, but now lost, it is possible that these same more ancient ballads were composed shortly after the time in which the hero of them lived, and the fact of their antiquity, and universal popularity is favorable to the supposition that Robin Hood was a real personage.

There is internal evidence that these ballad-romances faithfully represent the manners of the age in which they are supposed to have been written. The fondness for hunting, and for fighting with sword, quarter-staff and fist in trials of skill, the love of good cheer and jolly fellowship, of uncouth jokes and pranks, and an ill-concealed animosity to the churchmen and the overbearing Norman nobility, are highly characteristic of the English yeomanry of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The "Lytell Geste" embodies all these characteristics, and an analysis of it—(an excellent one is given in an article on Robin Hood in the *Westminster Review*,)*—will present them all, so that there need be no reference to the ballads which relate similar exploits, such as "Robyn Hode and the Monk," "Robyn Hode and the Potter," "Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne," "Robin Hood and the Stranger," "Robin Hood and the Bishop," "Robin Hood and the Butcher," "Robin Hood and the Beggar," "Robin Hood and the Tanner," and so on, all of which may be said to "ring the changes" on the same theme. Mr. Gutch believes that the "Lytell Geste" is the composition of a writer of the time of Chaucer, probably between 1377 and 1413, or from 80 to 100 years after the death of Edward I., to whom reference is made in it; but hitherto not a vestige of any manuscript has been discovered from which the early black letter editions were printed. Mr. Ritson says that it was first printed by Wynken de Worde, about the year 1489, in old quarto black letter. The poem is composed of 454

* No. LXV., March, 1840.

stanza, divided into eight fyttes or cantos, and the following is an outline of the story :

1st Fytte. Robin is in Barnsdale Wood with his faithful comrades Little John, Scathlocke and Much the miller's son. He sends them out to seek for a guest before sitting down to dinner. They meet with Sir Richard of the Lee, and bring him to Robin. The knight is in great distress because he has mortgaged his lands to the abbot of St. Mary's at York for £400, and the time for redeeming them having elapsed, he will lose them because he cannot pay off the mortgage. Robin lends him the money and gives him presents, and sends Little John with him, as his squire, to the abbot to redeem the lands.

2d Fytte. The abbot is in the act of acquainting his brethren that unless the knight redeems his lands that very day, they will be forfeited to the convent. The prior intercedes for the knight, but is snubbed by the abbot, the treasurer, the chief justice and the sheriff, who are all present and ready to confiscate the lands to the convent. While they are congratulating themselves on this accession to their revenues, the knight arrives, assumes an air of poverty, and pleads for time, but is reviled by the abbot. He then, to the surprise of all, produces the £400 and walks unceremoniously away. After a time he saves up £400 to repay Robin Hood, and sets off with the money and various presents to seek him in Barnsdale.

3d Fytte. This relates principally to Little John. The sheriff of Nottingham, having witnessed Little John's skill in archery, asks him who he is. Little John replies that he was born in Holderness, that his name is Reynolds Greenleaf, and that the knight is his master. The sheriff engages him for a year at a salary of twenty marks. But Little John having on one occasion been deprived of his breakfast, makes a great disturbance in the house, breaks open the buttery, beats the butler, and takes his fill of meat and wine. Thereupon the man-cook attacks him, and they fight with broadswords for an hour without being able to hurt each other. They then make friends and feast together. After this they break open the treasury, steal £303 and the silver

plate and join Robin Hood in Sherwood Forest. Little John there finds the sheriff hunting, and persuades him, by an artifice, to follow him to another part of the forest. The sheriff is betrayed to Robin Hood, who makes him dine off his own plate, strips him of his clothes, and compels him to sleep a night in the forest. The next morning he releases him on his taking an oath to be a friend to Robin Hood and his men in case of need.

4th Fytte. The scene of this canto is laid at Barnesdale, on the afternoon of the day appointed for the repayment of the £400 loaned to the knight. Little John, Much and Scathlocke are sent out by Robin to stop travellers and bring them to dinner. They meet the treasurer of St. Mary's abbey with his retinue. Dispersing the latter, they force the abbot to accompany them to Robin. They then search his trunks and find £800, which they confiscate. The monk goes away amid jeers, and the knight arrives soon afterwards with the £400; but Robin not only refuses to take it, but gives him £400 more, relating how he has acquired it.

5th Fytte. There is a shooting match for a golden-headed arrow, on the outskirts of Sherwood Forest. This has been got up by the sheriff of Nottingham, in order to entrap Robin Hood. The latter attends with five men, but places 140 more in ambush. He wins the arrow, and the sheriff attempts to seize him; then ensues a fight in which the sheriff and his men are driven away, but Little John is wounded in the knee. He begs Robin to kill him in order to prevent his falling into the sheriff's hands; but Robin refuses. Much takes him upon his back and carries him a mile, when they come to a castle. Here dwells Sir Richard of the Lea, who gladly welcomes Robin and his men, and mans the walls to resist the sheriff and his troop.

6th Fytte. The sheriff of Nottingham, aided by the sheriff of Yorkshire, now calls on the castle to surrender. The knight refuses to deliver up the outlaws until he has learned the king's pleasure on the subject. The sheriff posts away to London to see the king, who tells him that he himself will be in Nottingham within a fortnight, and commands him to go back and assemble all the bow-men he can find

Meanwhile Robin and his men return to the forest, and Little John recovers from his wound. The sheriff lies in wait for the knight, surprises him while hunting, binds him and carries him off towards Nottingham. The knight's wife hurries off to Robin Hood and implores his aid. Robin and his men hasten to Nottingham, where they kill the sheriff, release the knight, and take him to the forest.

7th Fytte. King Edward I., on his return from the Holy Land, takes a strong force with him to find Robin. After seeking him six months in vain, he is about to give up the pursuit, when a forest-keeper suggests that the king shall disguise himself, along with five of his best knights, in monk's dress, and let him conduct them to the outlaw's haunts. The king adopts this plan, is met by Robin and robbed of £20. Then he shows Robin the royal seal with a friendly greeting from the king. Robin invites him to dinner, feasts him on venison, and then shows him what his men can do in archery. Robin misses the mark purposely, and then asks the king to pay him the forfeit, viz.: a blow on the bare head. The king refuses, but on being pressed, knocks him down. By this they recognize the king, who pardons the knight and the outlaws, and engages them to enter his service.

8th Fytte. The king and his attendant knights, borrowing outlaws' dresses, then amuse themselves by frightening the people of Nottingham, and reinstate Sir Richard in his domains. Robin remains fifteen months in the king's court, but all his men, except Little John and Scathlocke, desert him and return to the forest. At last, Robin, yearning for his old life, obtains leave of the king to revisit Barnesdale for a few days; but when he arrives there he abandons the king's service and joins his old band. He lives twenty-two years after this in Barnesdale. At length, falling sick of a fever, he goes to the prioress of Kyrkesly (Kirklees), a kinswoman of his, to get bled.

This wicked woman is engaged in an intrigue with Sir Roger of Doncaster, and they conspire to murder him. Accordingly, she bleeds him, and locking him in his room, leaves him to bleed to death. Little John, fearing foul play, hastens to the priory, breaks open the door of the room,

kneels at Robert's feet and begs permission to burn Kyrkely Hall and the Priory. Robin refuses to grant it, but asks for his bow and arrows and shoots an arrow out of the window, directing that they shall bury him where it falls. He then dies and is buried according to his request.

Such is the outline of the "*Lytell Geste*," and, indeed, of Robin Hood's career as an outlaw. We may here mention that the traditional spot of his interment in the park at Kirklees has lately been secured by an enclosure of neat and solid masonry, supporting a strong and lofty iron railing, with a slender tapering pillar at each corner.

From traditions we pass on to private records and evidences. These are but slight, and scarcely worthy of credit. Such are the alleged relics of Robin Hood's bow, arrows, cap, chairs, slippers, etc., all of which have been mentioned by one traveller or another, apparently in good faith, but when we reflect upon the facility with which relics are manufactured, our faith in them disappears. Mr. Gutch selects a few of these notices by tourists,* and we cite them as specimens of credulity. "We omitted the sight of Fountain's Abbey, where Robin Hood's bow is kept." This is a quotation from Ray's "*Itineraries*," in the year 1700,† and it appears that this careful investigator did not even think it worth while to look at the relic, but was content with being told that it might be seen. The next traveller quoted was a little more curious. This is Mr. Brome, who published in 1700 his "*Travels over England*." "Having," he says: "pleased ourselves with the antiquities of Nottingham, we took horse and went to visit the well and the ancient chair of Robin Hood, which is not far from hence, within the forest of Sherwood. Being placed in the chair, we had a cap, which they say was his, very formally put upon our heads, and having performed the usual ceremonies befitting so great a solemnity, we received the freedom of the chair, and were incorporated into the society of that renowned brotherhood."<‡

A pretty farce, this! No doubt Mr. Brome and his friends thereupon felt equal to any feat in archery. We ourselves,

* *Lytell Geste*, vol. i, p. 64. † p. 167. ‡ p. 85.

once travelling in the highlands of Scotland, came upon a small cottage near the pass of Aberfoil, whence sallied forth an old crone with a very long and very old-fashioned gun, which she gravely assured us was Rob Roy's fowling piece, and we were very much edified at the sight; but it occurred to us at the time that if Sir Walter Scott had not written Rob Roy, and thereby attracted tourists to the spot, the gun would have remained rusting in the hiding place where its real owner put it. Here are two more specimens, one from Robert Dodsley.§ "On one side of this forest (Sherwood), towards Nottingham, I was shown a chair, a bow, and an arrow, all said to have been his, Robin Hood's, property." The other is from William Hutton.* "I was pleased with a slipper belonging to the famous Robin Hood, fifty years ago, at Saint Ann's Well, near Nottingham, a place upon the borders of Sherwood Forest, to which he resorted." In none of these cases, however, do the tourists say they believed in the authenticity of the relics. If the fame of Robin Hood depended on them, we fear it would stand but a slight chance of immortality.

Following the Baconian, order we come to fragments of stories, passages of books, and the like. Leaving out of question, for the moment, the numerous songs and sayings already mentioned or alluded to, we shall here consider such notices of the famous outlaw as are to be found in works on history. We have already quoted that remarkable passage from "Fordun's Scotichronicon," wherein he speaks of "Robertus Hode and Littill Johne," as "*ille famosissimus sicarius*," and as living in the reign of Henry III. There is, however, a still earlier mention of Robin Hood; it occurs in a very curious rhyming Latin poem, contained in Peck's supplement to Dugdale's "Monasticon," and bearing the following title: "Prioris Alnwicensis de bello Scotico apud Dumbarr, tempore regis Edvardi I. dictamen sive rithmus Latinus, quo de Willielmo Wallace, 'Scotico illo Robin Whood,' plura sed invidiose canit;" and in the margin are the following

§ *Travels of Tom Thumble over England and Wales*, p. 82.

* *Journey from Birmingham to London*, 1785, p. 174.

date and reference: "22 Julii, 1304. 32 E. I., Regist. prem. fol. 59 a." This manuscript is now in the British Museum. It proves that Robin Hood was celebrated as a popular hero so far back as the year 1304, the twenty-third of the reign of Edward I. Next we have the continuation and completion, as well as revision of the *Scotichronicon* of Fordun by his pupil, Bemer, abbot of St. Columb, who, in speaking of the events of the year 1266, says: "Isto etiam anno grassati sunt acrius Angliæ, barones exheredati et regales; inter quos Rogerus de Martusmari marchias Walliæ, Johannes Daynillis insulam de Heli occupant. Robertus Hode nunc inter fruteta et dumeta sylvestria exulabat."^{*}

Here he is treated as a well-known historical character. The "Rimes of Roben Hod" are mentioned by the writer who calls himself "Piers Ploughman," who lived in the reign of Edward III., or about the year 1360, and is generally supposed to have been Robert Langland. He says:

"I cannot parfitli ni pateroster, as the priest it singeth,
But I can ryme of Roben Hode and Randolf, erl of Chester.
But of our lorde or our ladye I lerne nothyng at all."

The last quotation we shall make is from a song on woman, found in a manuscript in the Lambeth Palace Library, which was written in the fifteenth century. It runs thus:

"He that made this songe full good
Came of the northe and of the southern blode,
And somewhat kyne to Robyn Hode;
Yit all we be nat soo."[†]

We might easily fill pages with extracts from subsequent writers, wherein mention is made of Robin Hood, but, beyond showing that the subject was very popular, they would prove nothing more than these we have made from writers in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries can do, which amounts to this: that some time previous to the year 1300 a person named Robin Hood was very popular and much talked about, and that he was an outlaw and robber, of singularly generous and humane disposition, who despoiled none but the rich and tyrannical, selfish, and dishonest, and

^{*} *Scotichronicon*, ed. Goodall, vol. ii., p. 104. [†] No. 306, fol. 135.

who protected the helpless, fed the poor, and relieved the distressed; that he never was uncourteous to a woman, &c.

In 1852 the Rev. Joseph Hunter, an English clergyman, published a tract in which he traced out the history of Robin Hood, and attempted to prove that he lived in the reign of Edward II. (1307-27); also that he was an adherent of the earl of Lancaster at the battle of Boroughbridge in 1322. But the discovery of the MSS. above mentioned, dated 1304, wherein Wallace is styled the Scottish Robin Hood, is sufficient to disprove Mr. Hunter's theory. He thinks that the "*Lytell Geste*" was written by Richard Rolle, the poet of Barnesdale in the reign of Richard the Third. (1483-5).

Having thus, as we think, established the fact that Robin Hood was a real personage, and performed the kind of exploits recorded of him; and that the scenes of these exploits were the forests of Sherwood, in Nottinghamshire, and Barnesdale, in Yorkshire, we proceed to discuss the question as to the time in which he lived. The evidence on this point is very conflicting, and the unravelling of the difficulties has been rendered more unwelcome as a task since fiction has thrown its charms over the subject, and the brilliant pages of Scott and the graphic pen of James have so interwoven the memory of the bold outlaw with that of the model champion of England, Richard Cœur de Lion, that it seems an almost sacrilegious task to dispel the fascinations of "*Ivanhoe*" and "*Forest Days*." Yet this must be done, if we are honestly in search of the truth. As already stated, there are three theories as to the era of Robin Hood. The first is, that he lived in the time of Richard I. (1189-99); the second, that he lived in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. (1260-90); the third, that he lived in the reign of Edward II. (1307-27). The last-mentioned theory has been disposed of, and there remain the other two.

It must be confessed that a formidable array of authorities can be brought forward in support of what we may call the Ricardian theory. There is, first of all, an old manuscript *Life of Robin Hood*, being No. 715 of the "*Sloan Manuscripts*" in the British Museum, and printed by Thoms

in his "Prose Romances." It is of unknown date and parentage; some of it is illegible, but what is legible appears to be little more than a prose version of the "Lytell Geste," with two or three others of the Robin ballads incorporated with it. The commencement of this "Life" is at variance with the concluding portion of the "Lytell Geste." The "Life" begins thus: "Robin Hood was borne at Locksley, in Yorkshire, or, after others, in Nottinghamshire, in the dayes of Henry the Second, about the yere 1160; but lyued tyll the latter end of Richard the Fyrst." It will be remembered that the "Lytell Geste" introduces King Edward, on his return from the Holy Land, and speaks of him by name; but in the "Life" he is merely described as "the king." The manuscript, however, is not older than 1522, for it refers to Major's commendation of Robin as "the prince of all thieves and robbers," and Major, or Mayer, published his book in 1521.

On the Ricardian side appear the formidable names of Augustin Thierry, the great French historian, Sir Walter Scott, G. P. R. James, Sir Edward Coke, Wright, Ritson, Clarke, Major, Stowe, Fuller, Dr. Stukely, Warner, and Grafton. On the Edwardian side are the less eminent names of Charles Knight, Spencer T. Hall, Fordun, Bower, Gutch, and allies; but their opinions are fortified by the "Lytell Geste," the "Statute of Winchester," and other extrinsic evidence, which shall be noticed in due order. The authority of Sir Walter Scott and James is, in fact, no authority at all. It added greatly to the effect of their romances to introduce Robin Hood and Richard I. together on the scenes, and there was sufficient vagueness and uncertainty about the era of the outlaw to enable them to do so without any very serious charge of anachronism. Sir Walter was rather a sinner in this way, for he has been convicted of several errors in chronology. But he was a novelist, not a historian, and in consideration of his overpowering merits in other respects, he may well be forgiven for his inaccuracies.

With Augustin Thierry, however, it is different. He has rendered great service to the history of England by his graphic and thoughtful account of the conquest of that country by the

Normans; and he is almost the first historian who has profoundly investigated the predatory state of society which existed in England during the two centuries which succeeded the battle of Hastings, and the domestic and civil economy of our ancestors, their public and private sports, pastimes, and amusements. His great work has already become classical, and he is, therefore, an adversary deserving of the greatest respect. It may be observed here, however that an English writer almost simultaneously with him adopted the same line of argument and quoted the same authorities. The first French edition of Mr. Thierry's history was published in 1825, and appeared again in 1826, and Clarke's "*Vestigia Anglicana*" was published in 1826. In both of these works there is an able vindication of Robin Hood's character, and on similar grounds. If one did not see the other's book the coincidence is remarkable. M. Thierry says: "After his victory at Nottingham, King Richard, wishing for recreation, made a journey into the largest forest in England, extending from Nottingham to the centre of the county of York, over a space of several hundred miles, and called by the Saxons, Sirewood, which, in course of time, was changed into Sherwood . . . About the time that this heroic prince, the pride of the Norman barons, visited the forest of Sherwood, there dwelt under the shade of that celebrated wood, a man who was the hero of the serfs, the poor, and the obscure; or, in one word, of the Anglo Saxon race. 'Then,' says an old historian, 'arose among the disinherited the famous brigand Robin Hode, whom the common people are so fond of celebrating in their games and stage-plays, and whose exploits, chaunted by strolling ballad-singers, delight them above all things.' This short passage is all that the chronicles positively say of the most celebrated Saxon that had chosen Hareward for his model."

We may here pause a moment to notice the extraordinary inadvertence — to use a mild phrase — of this distinguished historian, in quoting from Fordun. He

* *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* vol. iii. pp. 234-50.

translates the expression "*famosissimus sicarius*" by "famous brigand," instead of "notorious cut-throat," and he entirely omits the context, "*Hoc in tempore*," which is explained by what comes before to mean the time of the civil war of 1265, and not that of Richard I. This omission is the more extraordinary, as Thierry is one of the most painstaking of historians; and it leads us to think, that, in his heart, he wished to favor and sustain the comparatively modern idea of Richard and Robin being contemporary, which had also then recently been made so popular by the romance of "*Ivanhoe*."

Thierry's theory, being based upon Fordun, can have no greater authority than the latter, and that is adverse to the Ricardian. The next authority we shall notice is Mair, or Major, who wrote in the time of Henry the Eighth, A. D. 1521, and whose statement has been incorporated by Stowe in his "*Annals*"* by translation. It runs thus: "About these times (the reign of Richard I.) as I conjecture, Robert Hood, an Englishman, and Little John, most notorious thieves, concealed themselves in the woods, seizing only the goods of opulent men. They killed no one unless he attacked or resisted them for the protection of his property. Robert maintained by his robberies a hundred archers most admirably adapted for warfare, and four hundred of the bravest men did not dare to attack them. All Britain uses in songs the exploits of this Robert. He permitted no women to be molested, nor took away the property of the poor, but he freely bestowed on them the property taken from abbots. I condemn the rapine of the men, but he was the prince and the most humane of all thieves."† This historian (Major) gives no reason why he conjectures that Robin Hood and Richard I. were contemporaries; his statement is mere con-
 *

p. 159.

† The passage in Latin is: "*Circa hæc tempora, ut auguror Robertus Hudus Anglus et Parous Joannes latrones famosissimi in nemoribus latuerunt, solum epulenterum riserum bona diripientes. Nullum nisi res invadentem vel resistentem pro suarum rerum tuitione occiderunt. Centum sagillarias ad pugnam optissimos Robertus latrocinii aluit, quos 400 viri fortissimi invadere non audebant. Rebus hujus Roberti gestis tota Britannia in cantibus utitur. Foeminam nullam opprimi permisit, nec pauperum bona surripuit, verum eos ex abbatum bonis oblatiis opipare pavit. Viri rapinam improbo, sed latronum omnium humanissimus et princeps erat.*"

ture, and its subsequent adoption by Stowe gives it no greater authority.

The notices of Hobin Hood by Dr. Fuller are not a whit more satisfactory. Speaking of the outlaw's birthplace he says, as if in doubt, "Robert Hood, (if not by birth,) by his chief abode, was this country-man (Nottinghamshire)." * "His principal residence was in Sherwood Forest, in this county, though he had another haunt (he is no fox that hath but one hole) near the sea in the North Riding of Yorkshire, where Robin Hood's bay still retaineth his name; not that he was any pirate, but a land thief, who retreated to these unsuspected parts for his security." † The doctor adds that Robin played his pranks in the reign of Richard I., or about the year 1200, but upon what authority this statement is made does not appear.

Dr. Stutely, Ritson, Grafton, Leland, the "Sloane MS.," and the "Harleian MS." attempt to fix the true epoch of Robin Hood by means of a pedigree (of which more will be said presently) which brings him down to the time of Richard I. The "Sloane MS." asserts that he was born about the year 1160. Charlton says that he was living in the days of the abbot, Richard, and Peter, his successor; that is between the years 1176 and 1211. ‡ Warner refers his "existence to better daies, first Richard's daies;" § and the great legal luminary, Sir Edward Coke, says authoritatively, that Robin Hood lived in the reign of King Richard I. In the "History of George-a-Green, pindar of the town of Wakefield," published anonymously in London in 1706, the date of the hero's exploits is laid in the reign of Richard I. Mr. Ritson, following the foregoing authorities, has come to the same conclusion as regards Robin Hood, asserting that he was born in the reign of King Henry II., and about the year of Christ 1160, and that he died on the 18th of November, 1247, being the thirty-first year of King Henry III., and (if the date assigned to his birth be correct) about the eighty-seventh of his age. ¶ There is a great show of circumstan-

* *Worthies of England*, p. 329. † *Ibid.* ‡ *History of Whitby, York*, 1779. 4to.
§ *Albion's England*, p. 132. ¶ *Institutes*, p. 197.

¶ *Abridgement of the Life of Robin Hood*, *passim*.

tiality about this which is thus controverted by Mr. Wright, who, however, appears inclined to doubt altogether the existence of Robin Hood.

Mr. Wright thinks that the compiler of the legend of the "Lytell Geste" obtained his materials for each fyttre from the ballads previously in existence. He then proceeds to dispose of the mention of King Edward I. in the ballad, by suggesting that it is the first instance of the name of a king occurring in these ballads, and that it was nothing more than what was customary, viz., to insert in the ballad, when sung at the Robin Hood festivals, the name of the king who was reigning at the time. He doubts the authenticity of the passages quoted from the *Scotichronicon*, and he concludes thus: "We have now given an abstract of all the remains of the cycle of Robin Hood in its older form. We have seen that it consisted of the common, popular stories of outlaw warfare in the green woods, as they were sung at the festivals and rejoicings of the peasantry, with whom, at the time the songs were made, such tales would naturally have been favorites. As far as we can judge, the different incidents of the cycle were not numerous, and it is probable that the compiler of the "Geste" introduced into it all he knew. This poem, indeed, seems, at the period of its publication, to have been the grand representative of the cycle, and to have contained, at least, most of that which was commonly sung about the roads and streets. The foregoing slight review of the material of the cycle, and of the nature of the stories which formed it, brings us at once to conclude that the character and popular history of Robin Hood was formed upon the ballads, and not the ballads upon the person. There arises, however, thereupon, an interesting question—who was the person that in these ballads bears the name or title of Robin Hood?—a question, at the same time, which certainly does not admit of a very easy solution."²¹

The solution, in our opinion, is not so difficult as Mr. Wright thinks. We have already given our reasons for believing that Robin Hood is a real personage, and need not

²¹*Essay on the Literature, Superstitions, and History of England in the Middle Ages.*

recapitulate them. We shall confine ourselves to the question of the era in which he lived, and, having noticed the principal authorities for the theory that he was cotemporary with Richard I., we shall pass in review those who favor the Edwardian theory.

First of all, there is the "Lytell Geste" itself, one of the most ancient of English ballads. It mentions Edward by name; and that it was Edward I. who was meant, is evident from the circumstance that Robin Hood is alluded to in the old Latin poem before quoted, bearing date A. D. 1304. Edward I. died in 1307. Then there is the evidence of Fordun and Bower, before commented on. Further, there is the "Statute of Winchester," enacted in the year 1285, providing for the suppression of robbers and vagrants, called promiscuously *Robertds-men* in the statute; which term is thus explained by Lord Coke: "He (Robin Hood) lived by robbery, burning of houses, felony, waste and spoil, and principally by and with vagabonds, idle wanderers, night-walkers, and drawlatches, and, albeit, he lived in Yorkshire; yet men of his quality took their denomination of him, and were called *Robertds-men* throughout all England." The statute of 5 Edw. III., c. 14 (passed in 1332), recites the "Statute of Winchester," and provides for the arrest of these same *Robertds-men*. These acts of Parliament were further confirmed and amended by the act 7 Richard II., c. 5 (A. D. 1382), in which the term *Robertds-men* is used. Why is it, if Robin Hood lived A. D. 1190, no statute against his followers and imitators was enacted until the year 1285? Why was it enacted then? For the following reasons, very ably set forth by Thierry, Mr. Spencer T. Hall, and Mr. Guthrie:

Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, had been the leader of a great national movement in favor of the emancipation of the middle and lower classes from the tyranny and rapacity of the king and his Norman nobility. He had gained a decisive victory at Lewes, on the 14th May, 1264, wherein Henry III., his sons, Edward and Richard, and his grandson Henry, were made prisoners. The result of this battle was the convocation of a parliament to which knights of the

shires, citizens and burgesses were summoned, and there the foundation of representative government was laid in England. But seven months after the meeting of this great assembly, Prince Edward (afterwards Edward I.) made his escape, through the treachery of the earl of Gloucester, and, hastily collecting the royal forces, fell upon Leicester, by surprise, with greatly superior numbers, and annihilated the hopes of the nation for a time, by exterminating De Montfort and his supporters at the remorselessly sanguinary battle of Evesham, on the 6th August, 1265. Henry III., a feeble-minded, unmanly and vindictive man, gratified his vengeance on the people. We continue the narrative in the eloquent language of Thierry :

"On the death of De Montfort the old patristic superstition of the English was awakened in his favor. Being an enemy to the foreigners and, as a contemporary writer expresses it, a defender of the rights of lawful property, he was honored with the same title as the popular gratitude had conferred upon those who, in the time of the Norman invasion, had devoted themselves in defence of the country. Simon, like them, received the appellation of defender of the natives. To call him traitor and rebel was declared to be a falsehood; and he was proclaimed a saint and martyr as much as Thomas à Becket himself."*

If, since the fatal field of Hastings, no day had ever been so disastrous to English freedom as that of Evesham,—if the great cause of constitutional establishment had its Harold in De Montfort, it had also its Hereward—yet more persevering and invincible than him of old—in Robin Hood, one of the disinherited and banished of that melancholy period. Bower (before quoted) tells us that in the year after that in which the battle of Evesham was fought, "Robin Hode wandered among the woody clumps and thickets." The yeomanry, with their bows, in those days, formed the main strength of the combatants on foot in an army, and they had cordially joined De Montfort. Robin Hood, no doubt, had drawn his formidable weapon with good effect at Lewes and at Evesham. On the defeat and death of their great leader, the insurgents fled to the mountains, forests, and morasses, and carried on predatory warfare against the

* *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, vol. iii. pp. 234-250.

barons. It took Prince Edward two years to suppress these insurrections. Hampshire, Berkshire and Surrey were ravaged by banditti under the command of Adam Gordon, the most athletic man of the age. They were surprised in a wood near Alton. The prince engaged Gordon in single combat, wounded and unhorsed him; and then, in reward of his valor, granted him his pardon. But the stronghold of these outlaws was in the country north of the Trent, where there was vast tracts of forest, abounding in deer and other animals which afforded nourishment as well as sport. And here flourished such popular heroes as Robin Hood and Little John, Adam Bell, Clym of the Clough, and William of Cloudesly, who lived there in defiance of the barbarous forest laws of their Norman oppressors. Familiar with every thicket, copse, and woodland way, they easily eluded pursuit, and, moreover, found staunch friends in the poor, whom they invariably befriended, and who gave them timely notice of the approach of an enemy, or of a wealthy traveller whom they might plunder. No wonder, then, that when Prince Edward went in pursuit of them, he roamed the forest for months without finding them.

"Half a yere dwelled our couly kynge
In Notyngham, and well more,
Cande he not here of Robyn Hode,
In what countre that he were :
But alway went good Robyn
By halke and eke by hyll,
And alway slewe the kynge's dere,
And welt them at hys wyll."

Mr. Jabez Allies, a Worcestershire antiquary,* claims Loxley in Staffordshire, or Loxley in Warwickshire, as the birth-place of Robin Hood, and the forest of Feckenham, in Worcestershire, as the scene of his early exploits; and thinks that it was not until after the battle of Evesham that he removed to Sherwood forest, in Nottinghamshire, and to Barnesdale forest, in Yorkshire. He is also of opinion that Robin Hood was at the battle of Evesham, and that he is the same personage as "The Devil's Huntsman," or "Harry-

* Author of a tract *On the Social Hunter of Bransgrove, Hence the Hunter and Robin Hood*. London, 1845.

ca-nab," and "the Jovial Hunter of Bronesgrove." Dr. Nash* points out the names of many places in Worcestershire, and incidents in the history of that county, which tend to confirm the suggestion of Mr. Allies.

Mr. Spencer T. Hall, an enthusiast in everything relating to Robin Hood, says: "Subsequent to the battle of Evesham, 1265, Robin Hood was the acknowledged commander of a regularly organized band of men astonishingly expert in archery, ordinarily about one hundred strong, but capable of being increased *ad libitum* as occasion might require, because of his influence not only with the common people, but even with many of high degree, who were, doubtless from kindness to them in particular emergencies, very warmly attached to him. It is evident that this acknowledged right to command—which we never hear of any one disputing with him—consisted more in the excellence of his intellect, his consummate policy, and the natural dignity of his character, than in the strength of his arm or any personal love of distinction." In a letter addressed to the editor of a Worcestershire newspaper, who had raised a doubt upon Mr. Allies' conjectures, the latter says: "Before I conclude, I must observe that it is pretty clear, from the evidence I have collected relative to Robin Hood, that he was not contemporary with Richard I., as is generally supposed, but with Henry III. and Edward I.; and, if I may add another conjecture to those contained in the addenda to my treatise, I would say it is possible that either Robin Hood's father, or grandfather, might, like thousands of others, have been most tyrannically dispossessed of land by Henry II., when he enlarged Feckenham forest; and, if so, this, in a measure, would account for Robin's decided hostility to the forest laws."†

If the foregoing evidence will not suffice to prove that Robin Hood lived in the time of Edward I., and not in that of Richard I., the matter must stand where it is, for there is none better to be produced—at least none has as yet been discovered. It remains, then, to decide whether he was of noble birth or a yeoman—a word which in England sig-

* *History of Worcestershire*. Introd., pp. 65-68.

† *The Forester's Offering*.

nifies a plebeian of the most respectable class, next in rank below a gentleman. Mr. Ritson adopted the first theory, and says confidently: "His (Robin Hood's) extraction was noble, and his true name Robert Fitzooth." This assertion was based mainly on Dr. Stukeley's statement.* The learned doctor made out a complete pedigree for the bold outlaw. It runs thus: "Ralph Fitzothes, or Fitzooth, a Norman, who had come over to England with William Rufus, married Maud, or Matilda, daughter of Gilbert de Gaunt, earl of Kyme and Lindsey, by whom he had two sons, viz.: Philip, afterwards earl of Kyme, that earldom being part of his mother's dowry, and William Philip the elder, died without issue. William was a ward to Robert de Vere, earl of Oxford, in whose household he received his education, and who, by the king's express command, gave him in marriage to his own niece, the youngest of the three daughters of the celebrated lady, Roisia de Vere, daughter of Aubrey de Vere, earl of Guisnes, in Normandy, and lord high chamberlain of England, under Henry I. and of Adeliza, daughter to Richard de Clare, earl of Clarence and Hertford, by Payne de Beauchamp, baron of Bedford, her second husband. The offspring of this marriage was our hero, Robin Fitzooth, commonly called Robin Hood." Dr. Stukeley further says (in a manuscript note of his copy of "Robin Hood's Garland," now in the Bodleian Library,) that "Robin Hood took to this wild way of life in imitation of his grandfather, Geoffrey de Mandeville, who, being a favorer of Maud, empress, king Stephen took him prisoner at St. Albans, and made him give up the Tower of London, Walden, Plessis, &c., upon which he lived on plunder."

On what slender foundations Dr. Stukeley reared such an edifice will be seen when the authorities for it are cited. Grafton, the chronicler, states that in an old and ancient pamphlet he had seen it written: "This man descended of a noble parentage."[†] The "Sloane MS." says, "He was of . . . parentage," the material word illegible. The Harleian MS. note says: "It is said he was of noble

* *Paleographia Britannica*, No. 2, p. 115.

† Cited by Mr. Gutch, *Lyell Geste*, vol. I., p. 12.

blood." Leland, the antiquary, terms him *nobilis*.^{*} None of the most ancient ballads make any allusion to his noble birth, and it is not until we come to the Elizabethan dramatists that we find Robin figuring as earl of Huntingdon.

In 1601 two plays were written by Anthony Mundy and Henry Chettle, the titles of which were, "The downfall of Robert, earle of Huntington, afterwards called Robin Hood of merrie Sherwodde; with his love to chaste Matilda, the Lord Fitzwalter's daughter, afterwards his fair maide, Marian;" and "The death of Robert, earle of Huntington, otherwise called Robin Hood of merry Sherwodde; with the lamentable tragedie of chaste Matilda, his fair maid, Marian, poysoned at Dunmowe, by King John." In the year 1706 (as has been already mentioned), there was published in London "The history of George-a-Green," and it was dedicated to the steward, gentlemen, and inhabitants of Wakefield, by N. W. The author makes George and Robin contemporaries, and Robin figures as the first earl of Huntington. Mariana is Matilda, daughter to the Lord Fitzwalter; and having discovered the royal affections of Prince John for her, she retires into the forest of Sherwood "for the true love and affection she bore unto her best beloved Robin."

Now this is about all the evidence on which Dr. Stukeley made out his pedigree, and on which Mr. Ritson adopted his theory. Ritson died in 1803; since his day there has been much acute and laborious investigation brought to bear on the subject, the result of which has been to discredit entirely the story of the earldom of Huntingdon. We cannot do better than quote the language of Charles Knight in his "Old England," when speaking of the Lytell Geste. "This ballad, one of the finest in the language, which for beauty and dramatic power is worthy of Chaucer himself, about whose time it was probably written, has shared Robin Hood's own fate; that is, enjoyed a great deal of indiscriminating, and, therefore, worthless popularity. It has simply been looked on as one of the Robin Hood ballads; whilst, in fact, it surpasses all the others by its merits as by its antiquity, and its internal evidence of being

^{*} *Collectanea*, i., p. 54.

written by one who understood that on which he wrote; which is much more than can be said for the ballad-doers of later centuries—when Friar Tuck and Maid Marian first crept into the forester's company—when the gallant yeoman was created without ceremony earl of Huntingdon, and his own period put back about a century, in order that he and the Lion Heart might hob and nob it together." The Lytell Geste describes Robin as a yeoman, and this ought to settle the question, since none of the authorities cited in support of the opposite theory are so ancient as that ballad.

" Lythe and lysten, gentylmen,
That he of frebore blode;
I shall you tell of a good yeman,
His name was Robyn Hode."

We will conclude with the words of Sir Walter Scott: "The name of Robin Hood, if duly conjured with, should raise a spirit as soon as that of Rob Roy, and the patriots of England deserve no less their renown in our modern circles than the Bruces and Wallaces of Caledonia."^{*}

ART. VI.—*Biographies; Inaugurations of Statues; Public Speeches; Official Correspondence; Accounts of Presents and Donations, &c., &c., &c.* New York: Herald, Times, World, Tribune, &c. 1869.

Our politicians delight to tell us that we are the freest people on the face of the earth, but because they are politicians, and nothing better, they do not dare to tell us, if they know the fact, that no people within the same extensive range submit to so many gross impositions. We are reminded in a thousand forms how proud we ought to be, that we have no titled or hereditary aristocracy; but how few venture even to hint that we have what is a thousand-fold more pernicious—namely, an oligarchy, whose only claim to power, or consideration of any kind, is their money!

It is true that such information ought not to be necessary. How can we boast of our superior intelligence, if it fails to

* *Icarhoe.* Dedicatory Epistle.

direct our attention to what is passing daily before our eyes? One of the most important uses of knowledge is to enable us to distinguish good from evil, so that we may profit by the former and eschew the latter. It requires but a very slight exercise of the thinking faculty to see that men are great and powerful in this country, in proportion as they possess millions, and are disposed to *purchase* greatness and power, with those superfluous millions, which they know they cannot take with them to the grave. It is not necessary that the owners of millions should hold high official position, or any official position, in order to possess this power and attain this greatness. The person who, by means of his money, can induce the king, or the emperor, to comply with his wishes, has more power to do mischief than the king, or the emperor himself, because, if the sovereign can be bought, why not his subordinates? But were the former above being bought, which we cheerfully admit is sometimes the case, the disciple of Plutus might gain his point quite as well by purchasing the latter.

But let us suppose that the millionaire does not interfere at all in the affairs of government, can he not do abundant mischief, without any such interference, if he be a speculator? and who has ever heard of a millionaire, in ancient or modern times, who was not a speculator? It may be safely concluded that no one has ever amassed enormous wealth by the ordinary, legitimate profits of trade; and it is equally indisputable, that in every instance in which one of those immense fortunes has been made, numbers of honest persons have sustained losses that made their hearts grieve; nay, more, the poor who have been engaged in no other business than toiling hard with bone and sinew for their daily bread, have suffered bitterly from some of the processes by which the millionaire has amassed his pile.

Although this statement may seem unjust, as applied to millionaires in general, it might be easily illustrated by incontestable facts; thus, for example, how few of those whose greediness for wealth is boundless, scruple to lock up in their storehouses what the poor are in the utmost need of, and persistently refuse to sell it, until they have succeeded

in raising the market to its utmost height? Is it not notorious, upon the other hand, that millionaires have thrown large quantities of merchandise on the market, under certain circumstances, with no better or more honest motive than to ruin their competitors, so that they might add to their own millions by that ruin?

The amount of injury done in this manner is much greater than the public would believe; it is so great, indeed, that it could not be repaired by the largest sums which our most wealthy millionaires *could distribute freely among the people, by way of atoning for their past sins.* Let those who doubt this bear in mind, that a hundred dollars might be of more value to one at one time than a thousand at another. None understand this better than the millionaire; there are, perhaps, millionaires, who, if they had been caused to lose their first hundred might have been long enough in getting a second.

But the injury done by unscrupulous public monopolists is more odious, if not intrinsically greater, than that done by those equally unscrupulous and equally wealthy, who are engaged, however extensively, in private business. Take, for example, one or two of our railway monopolists; who considers himself an intelligent person, and is not aware of the fact that these persons destroy thousands of families in one season? What cares the speculator for this, when, in proportion, as he brings ruin on so many others, he increases his own millions? Still less need he care when a large proportion, if not the majority, of his victims, have no idea that it was he who did them the mischief. Nay, many of them think he is their friend all the time; and, in order to strengthen the illusion, he occasionally gets up fêtes for their entertainment!

Nothing is more common among our political orators than to contrast our people with the "down-trodden masses" of Europe. The latter, they tell us, have no idea of rights, and accordingly do not expect to be well treated; whereas the former know all about their rights, and therefore none dare meddle with them; but, so far, at least, as resentment for wrong is concerned, the reverse of this is the fact. Even the king or the emperor cannot play the tyrant very

long ; certainly if he does he must be ever watchful, or his life will be the forfeit. Let even the czar bring ruin on thousands of families in order to fill his own coffers, or for any other purpose, and his immense standing army could not save him.

Probably no European people are more peaceful, or more law-abiding, than the English ; but woe to the man, or the woman, that defrauds or oppresses them ! Most of our readers know how often they have made the highest officers of the government ; the greatest statesmen, and the bravest warriors ; quail before them. Even the Duke of Wellington could not prevent them from breaking every window in the fine residence (Apsley House) presented to him by the nation for having saved her from becoming the spoil of Napoleon. As for submitting to be defrauded by any private individual, no matter how many millions he owned, it would be impossible to constrain them. This is so well understood that the millionaires of England are always careful what they do. The Barings would not dare to imitate the example of some of our millionaires, even if inclined to do so, of which, indeed, there is no evidence. It is true that the fear of retribution is not the only check on the conduct of English millionaires ; there are many reasons for the difference between them and our millionaires ; but they need not be stated here. For the present it is sufficient to remark that money alone does not secure position in England ; those having an ambition to be great cannot purchase greatness there ; still less can they purchase impunity for themselves by the ruin of thousands.

We are often told that the French know less about their rights than the English, and consequently that they are more easily imposed upon by speculators. But the real facts do not justify any such statement. If they submit more quietly than the English to have the necessities of life forestalled on them by millionaire speculators, they certainly do not submit more quietly than our people ; but the reverse. This we might illustrate by many interesting examples ; but one will suffice, especially as it is "a case in point." Thus, in France, as well as in this country, millionaires have attempted to establish monopolies by which they could

command large sums of money and influence the market at any time, according as it happened to suit their own interests. In 1847, the Rothschilds had secured the control of several of the French railroads. It was suspected that their course in the management of the *Chemin de fer du Nord*, was not what it ought to be; many attributed to it the high prices for most of the necessities of life, which led to the revolution of February, 1848. Whether the charge was just or not, the indignant people wreaked their vengeance on Baron James Rothschild. They repaired in a large body to his magnificent château at Suresnes, and in spite of all the authorities could do to prevent them, set fire to, burned and pillaged it. The loss sustained by the baron was very great, the château having been newly furnished in the most costly manner, and adorned with some of the finest paintings and sculptures which money could purchase; but he had the shrewdness to profit even from so terrible a manifestation of "the wild justice of revenge." Instead of making any threat, or showing any sign of resentment, he began to contribute large sums for the benefit of the poor. Immediately after the revolution he sent his check for fifty thousand francs to the provisional government for the relief of the victims of February. In addition to contributing large sums in money for the benefit of the very class who burned and pillaged his château, he founded and endowed several charitable institutions. But all would not be sufficient had he persisted in those forestalling speculations which had proved so ruinous to a large proportion of the industrious class.

At the same time the Rothschilds cannot be considered exemplary men, with all their wealth, and their willingness, under certain circumstances, to make large donations. But, as millionaires, many consider them exemplary; although nowhere are they received on equal terms in good society. The emperor of Austria has indeed made a baron of one or two of the family, by way of rewarding them for the enormous sums of money they have, from time to time, furnished the government. In England they have been flattered in a similar manner in time of need; but never has the emperor of Austria, or the king or queen of England, been on visiting

terms with any member of the Rothschild family. Lionel Nathan, the head of the English branch of the house, was born in London; his liberality in giving donations caused him to be elected member of parliament in 1847, but being a Jew, he was not allowed to take his seat until 1858—eleven years after his election! * Although having millions at command, and very willing to pave the way with gold, all his efforts were in vain for these eleven years. It is well known that he would gladly have presented her majesty's ministers with fine houses; as for horses, every member of the government could have had a choice Arabian from him, had his wishes been complied with on such terms. But no; although both himself and his father had often given large sums to the government, he had to wait until the poorest of his Jewish brethren, entitled to a seat, were admissible.

The Rothschilds, as we have said, are respectable millionaires; yet it is universally believed that their boundless wealth has rendered them more corrupt than they would have been had they merely possessed a competency. Different reasons are assigned for this, but we need only mention one: nearly every member of the family has married his *niece* or *first cousin*, generally the former, so that no stranger, or even distant relative, should become a Rothschild millionaire. Even Baron James, the most respectable of the family, married the daughter of his brother, Solomon Rothschild. But neither the English nor the French care who their millionaires marry, provided they do not interfere with their interests, or attempt to ruin them with their gambling speculations.

But the worst conduct attributed to the Rothschilds, even when one of their princely residences was burned and pillaged, would be regarded anywhere as legitimate compared to that of which it is notorious some of our American millionaires are habitually guilty. The revelations made during the recent gold crisis can only be regarded as a casual illustration of this; even then the chief actors in the conspiracy against the public enjoyed perfect impunity even from censure. Only the subordinate speculators were condemned; these, although used as scapegoats, were but gently

dealt with. What cared they, or any malefactors like them, about denunciations? It was no news to them to find themselves infamous. Infamy was no trouble to them as long as they were not restrained from pursuing their infamous course. They saw, from daily observation and experience, that if they only succeeded in securing a certain amount of millions, not only would their infamy be forgotten, but in a few brief years they might have colossal statues erected to their *honor*, and attract around these statues, at their inauguration, crowds of enthusiastic, wide-mouthed admirers, including even ministers of the gospel!

Be it remembered, that the two or three persons who have borne the brunt of the public scorn, do not yet own even one railroad; before they are recognized as great and honorable men, they must own, at least, two or three that pay well. But once they are possessed of these, no matter how they get them, then their greatness and respectability are undisputed. They may then live on the most intimate terms with the highest of our rulers. If they wish to become great public functionaries, such as high chamberlains, ambassadors to foreign courts, &c., or even to make such of their hired eulogists or private secretaries, they have only to make a few liberal presents, and, if they are not very hard to be pleased, the whole affair will be arranged, in due time, to their entire satisfaction.

It is true that there were times when public offices were bought and sold openly like other commodities; though not in republics. This afforded the head of the state a handsome source of revenue. But the offices were not sold so loosely as might be supposed. The candidate for the purchase had to undergo a searching examination as to his qualifications; but, if not found unqualified, he might find a substitute, who should also be examined. Finally, if the price and qualifications proved satisfactory, a formal contract was entered into, by which the new official bound himself by adequate securities to perform his duties faithfully, and not to exact higher perquisites than his honest predecessors had been in the habit of charging.

It would not do at this time for the ambitious candidate,

even though a millionaire, to get somebody to prepare a biography of him, who would represent that he was familiar with ancient languages, the letters of whose alphabets he could hardly distinguish from each other, if that alone would secure him the position he coveted ! It was equally useless for the biographer to represent him (while laughing at him in his sleeve, and making his readers laugh, also) as the descendant, in a direct, legitimate line, of a very ancient and aristocratic, if not princely or royal family. Especially did all this prove a failure, if the millionaire candidate belonged to that class who, not only covet every good piece of land, or every handsome, convenient house that happens to be within the range of their vision, but unhesitatingly offers to buy it from the owner ; and, if the owner decline, become indignant and spiteful.

Yet such were sometimes successful even in classic times. We have a very interesting instance of this in the works of Plato. Socrates and some of his friends are discussing public matters, as usual ; referring to the people of Syracuse, one of the interlocutors proceeds to say : " And they have just now sent ambassadors, intending, as it seems to me, to *deceive*, in some way, the state. During our conversation, the ambassadors from Syracuse happened to pass by ; when, pointing to one of them, Erasistratus observed — ' That person, Socrates,' said he, ' is the most wealthy of the Siceliotes and Italiotes ; and how should he not be ? ' " &c. Erasistratus here proceeds to point out the different sources of the ambassador's wealth ; having satisfactorily proved that he is a millionaire, Socrates asks, as it were, incidentally, " What kind of person, Erasistratus, does this man seem to be in Sicily ? " " This man," said he, " both seems to be and *is* one of the most *knavish* of all the Siceliotes and Italiotes, *by how much he is the wealthiest* ; so that should you be willing to ask any Siceliotes whom he thought to be *the greatest rogue*, not one of them would mention any other person than him." *

Yet he is an ambassador, and his person must be considered as sacred by the Athenians, on pain of being regarded

* Plato's Works, vol. VI., *Eryxias*, c. 1, 2.

as at war with the Syracusians! We need hardly say that the sole object of the philosopher is not to describe an individual millionaire; but to show what importance should be attached, in general, to that class of mortals. After discussing the whole subject of amassing wealth, with the utmost moderation, and, without the least prejudice, the conclusion arrived at is, "that of necessity they who should appear to us to be the wealthiest, *are in the most depraved state.*"*

This has been the experience of all ages. What corrupts the nation corrupts the individual, and *vice versa*. And let those who doubt that money, or enormous wealth corrupts the nation, consult the most reliable historians of those nations which no longer exist. Neither Socrates nor Plato bears any testimony in regard to the demoralizing influence of millionaires, which is not fully corroborated by Thucydides, Strabo, and Lucian.

And has Rome had a different experience? Our reply is that there never has been a more complete unanimity on any subject than that between all the Roman historians and satirists, as to the chief cause of the downfall of Rome. As long as there were no millionaires to rob one-half of the people and corrupt the other half, Rome continued the mistress of the world, after she had once secured the prestige of a brave and powerful nation. No historian has given a more impartial, truthful account of his country than Sallust; no historian has traced effects to their causes with more sagacity or with more scientific precision. And what is his report on this subject? In the opening pages of his *Catalina*, he solemnly warns all posterity that riches (*divitiæ*) were the destruction of Rome. "First," he says, "the love of money, and then the love of power increased."† He shows, with the graphic force of a consummate artist, how it sapped and subverted all those noble virtues for which the Romans were distinguished before Roman millionaires openly purchased the right of robbing whole provinces. Sallust describes how gradually this state of things supervened; most justly does he compare the growing avarice to the invasion of a pestilence.‡ Becoming

* *Egyzius*, c. 30.

† *Igitur primo pecunie dein imperii cupido crevit.* *Bel. Cat.*

‡ *Post, ubi contagio, quasi pestilentia, invasit.*

more and more earnest and eloquent as he proceeds, he shows how the increasing avarice acted on body and mind, like a poison, rendering both effeminate. Nor does he forget how the greediness of the millionaire became more and more boundless and insatiable from day to day.*

Our readers may well believe that one Roman millionaire coveted his neighbor's house, while another coveted his neighbor's farm,† for we see instances enough of such covetousness in our own time. There was some hope, however, according to the historian, until wealth began to be regarded *as an honor* to those who had it; then talent, refinement and virtue were equally despised; honest poverty became a cause of reproach, &c., &c.‡

We have taken pains to quote the most important passages in the original, at the bottom of the page; we should have taken similar pains with the Greek, but our printers are no admirers of the latter. Our reason for being so careful in the present instance is, that, as already intimated, there are some of our millionaires who claim to be quite familiar with the classic languages; probably because those who aspire to be rulers are generally supposed to know more than those whom they wish to rule, even though the latter be the nominal or elected rulers!

It is true that the authorities we have hitherto quoted, as to the demoralizing influence of millionaires, are pagans. Perhaps money has acquired a different nature under the Christian dispensation; and it must be admitted that there are some facts which seem strongly to support that view of the case. Thus, for example, are not the pews in our christian churches sold by auction, like cast-off clothes, or spavined horses, to the highest bidders? Nay, do not our Christian ministers sell themselves to all sorts of speculators, who, in turn, want to make profit by them? And are not those same Christian ministers ready to do anything, however reprehensible, or shameful, for those who praise and recommend them to their own satisfaction as marketable goods?

* *Semper infinita, insatiabilis est.*

† *Domum alius, alius agros cupere.*

‡ *Postquam divitiarum honori esse ceperunt, et eas gloria, imperium potentia sequebatur; hebescere virtus, paupertas probro haberi, &c.—Bel. Gal.*

All this, and a good deal more, must be admitted ; yet, we think, that avarice is quite as demoralizing among Christians as it was among pagans ; nor can we believe that Christian (?) millionaires, as such, are entitled to any more honor or consideration, at the present day, than the pagan millionaires were in the days of Sallust, Tacitus, or Juvenal.

But let us pause for a moment, to see who will be regarded as a good authority on the subject. On a little reflection, we think it must be admitted that Milton ought to be accepted by our millionaires as well as by our parsons. As "Paradise Lost" has reference to the olden time, we pass over that and turn to "Paradise Regained." No one understood the ancient world better than Milton ; no one was more fully aware that the greatest deeds of which man was capable, were performed in poverty. In writing his great poems he had before his mind such men, who were voluntarily poor, as Socrates, Anaxagoras, Diogenes the Cynic, and Pythagoras, as well as Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler. It is not strange, then, that his representative millionaire is the arch enemy of mankind, who attempts to corrupt even Christ himself with his money ; and still less strange is it that it is into the mouth of Christ the poet puts the strongest denunciations of avarice and wealth, as compared to virtue, valour and wisdom. Satan concludes a long argument as follows :

"Therefore, if at great things thou would'st arrive,
Get riches first, get wealth, and treasure heap,
Not difficult, if thou hearken to me :
Riches are mine, fortune is in my hand ;
They whom I favor thrive in wealth again ;
While virtue, valour, wisdom, sit in want."*

It will be admitted that there is quite as much truth as poetry in this. The reply of the great founder of christianity carries conviction to every mind, that is not hopelessly depraved. It extends to over forty verses, but a few lines will be sufficient for our purpose :

"Among the heathen (for throughout the world
To me is not unknown what hath been done
Worthy of memorial) canst thou not remember
Quintius, Fabricius, Curius, Regulus ?

*Paradise Regained, B. ii., v. 426

For I esteem those names of men so poor,
 Who could do mighty things, and could contemn
 Riches, though offer'd from the hand of kings.
 And what in me seems wanting, but that I
 May also in this poverty as soon
 Accomplish what they did, perhaps, and more?
*Ecce not riches, then, the toil of fools.**

But did we mention all who have warned mankind against avarice and avaricious men, we should not omit one of the great thinkers and benefactors of all nations; and need we say that Washington would be among the number? So would Franklin, and all others whose memory we are bound to revere. In ancient or modern times not one of this class has attempted to exalt avarice above virtue, talent, refinement and wisdom. But who are the honored men of the present day in this republic? Who are the most familiar companions and most esteemed advisers of our rulers?

ART. VII.—*Juventus Mundi. The Gods and Men of the Heroic Age.*

By the Right Honorable WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE. 1 Vol., 8vo. pp. 554. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1869.

There is something grand in the spectacle of a great statesman busied with the administration of the affairs of an empire, and taking an active and leading part in all the important political and social questions of the day, sustaining the most envenomed attacks upon his conduct and motives, yet finding repose in studies which others call toil, and turning to the antique music of the Iliad and the Odyssey for mental recreation. Such a spectacle was exhibited in Lord Bacon, in the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis, and in the late Earl of Derby; all of whom turned to Greece for a theme on which to exercise their genius and scholarship. At an age when most men cease from labor, Lord Derby made his translation of Homer.

Now, while immersed in state problems which would crush the majority of men, or at all events incapacitate them from turning their attention to other things, we find the prime minister of Great Britain devoting the few leisure hours left

* *Ib.*, v. 444.

to him in his active life, to the profound study of the Homeric writings, seeking, both in public and private, to advance knowledge and elevate human existence, and cultivating literature, not merely as a scholar, to be charmed with the glorious melody and stately splendour of the Greek epos, but as a statesman, to learn debate and state craft from the Hellenic fountain head; as an orator, to learn thence how to move the spirit of modern men, and as a Christian, to trace out how all ancient history led up to the advent of the Messiah—Greece contributing an elegant language and a matchless intellectual discipline; Rome, a finished political organization; the East, its mystic abstractions; and Egypt and Chaldea, their philosophies, in order that christianity might inherit all, and carry forward the light that forever increases.

In 1858 Mr. Gladstone produced a very able and scholarly work, to which he gave the title of "Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age." The work before us, which he has named "*Juventus Mundi*," might, with equal propriety, have been styled part the second, or a continuation of the "studies," although some of the views which he put forward in the former have been considerably modified in the latter. The "*Juventus Mundi*" was composed during the parliamentary recesses of 1867 and 1868, a period of singularly fierce political excitement, occasioned by the reform bills for the amendment and extension of the elective franchise, by the proposed disestablishment of the Irish Church, and by the Fenian agitation in Ireland. The object which the author proposes to himself in this work shall be stated in his own language.*

"The immediate purpose of the former work was to draw out of the text of Homer, by a minute investigation of particulars, the results that it appeared to me to justify. Many of them were more or less new, and the process of inquiry was therefore exhibited in great, perhaps in excessive or wearisome, detail. I have now felt warranted to give a large space to deduction, and a smaller one to minute particulars of inquiry in a work which aims at offering some practical assistance to Homeric study in our schools and universities, and even at conveying a partial knowledge of this subject to persons who are not habitual students. . . . My

* *Preface*, pp. vi.—viii.

main object, then, in this and in the former work, has been to encourage, or, if I may so say, provoke, the close textual study of the poet, as the condition of real progress in what is called the Homeric question, and as a substitute for that loose and second-hand method, not yet wholly out of vogue in this country, which seeks for information about Homer anywhere rather than in Homer himself."

That Mr. Gladstone has accomplished his self-imposed task well, on the whole, may be learned from a perusal of the work. But his labors are not yet ended, he is yet to give to the world an analysis, or more properly, a concordance, of the contents of Homer's writings, and this he has promised to do as soon as other calls upon his time (including the settlement of the Irish land question and the pacification of Ireland) will permit.

Before noticing the leading features of the work, a few words must be devoted to the orthography, as regards proper names adopted by Mr. Gladstone. He has followed Mr. Grote in the nomenclature of the Greek deities, places, and men, though not to so rigidly harsh an extent. We think this a blemish, and believe that the attempt to revolutionize the old familiar names to which the ears of men have been accustomed, and which have been incorporated into the literature of the last two thousand years, will prove futile. There is no sufficiently important object to be gained by substituting the original Greek names in Roman type, for their Latin equivalents. Moreover the latter are the more musical and poetical, except in Greek poems; and sometimes the English forms of them are pleasanter. We prefer Homer to Homeros; Ulysses to Odusseus; Thucydides to Thoukudides; Clytemnestra to Clutaimnestra; Minerva to Athenè, and Venus to Aphroditè. Jupiter has a grander sound than Zeus, and Ceres looks better in print than Demeter does. As for Poseidon, Aïdonus, and Hephaistos, we beg them to remain in the original world, and let us have our old friends Neptune, Pluto, and Vulcan in their stead: and we can dispense with Phoibos-Apollon, being satisfied with plain Apollo.

Some will, perhaps, sneer at this feeling of attachment to familiar names; but they have become so interwoven in our language, and our very modes of thinking, that we do

not see any utility in attempting to change them. Moreover, there is a very large class of readers who, whatever their classical attainments may have been in their college days, have allowed their Greek and Latin to grow rusty. To such persons it would be almost necessary to go to school again, in order to understand some of the proposed changes. *Kuklopes* can easily be rendered into Cyclopes; but not so with *Scherië*, *Aiaë*, *Aiolë*, *Laistrugonië*, the *Phaiakes*, the *Phoinikes*, *Surië*; it requires a little consideraion before the unlearned can recognize in these names, Coreyra (Corfu), *Æced*, *Æolia*, *Lestrigonia*, the Pheacians, the Phœnicians, Syria; and thus the charm of an immense body of literature would be impaired.

Mr. Gladstone assigns a higher antiquity to Homer than that usually allowed. He considers the date of 1183 (1189?) B. C., fixed by Eratashenes, for the fall of Troy, to be merely conjectural, and thinks that event is quite as likely to have been older as to have been more recent. Why? He assigns no reason. Not only does he abstain from doing so, but he appears to be ignorant of the evidence there is in favor of a later date. Mr. Sharpe * makes use of the Egyptian chronology to determine the date of the Trojan war, which, according to him, should be placed between the years 925 and 900 B.C., on the following grounds: Herodotus says † that Proteus, the king of Egypt, who received Paris and Helen, on their flight from Sparta, was contemporary with the Trojan war, that there was only one reign between him and Sesostris (Shishah) who conquered Jerusalem, B. C. 960; and that there were twelve reigns between him and the Persian invasion of Egypt, B. C. 525. Allowing the computation of Herodotus as to the length of these reigns, this period would amount to 390 years, which would give the year B. C. 915 as that of the capture of Troy. Again, Manetho says ‡ that Thuoris, who reigned seven years, lived in the time of the Trojan war, and that he was succeeded by the 20th dynasty, which reigned from 135 to

* *Early History of Egypt*, pp. 158-162. † *Euterpe*, chap. 118-120.

‡ Quoted by Sharp, *Early History of Egypt*, p. 45.

172 years. Assuming that the 21st, 22d, 23d and 24th dynasties reigned contemporaneously with it, computing from the reign of So (B.C. 730), we have the year B. C. 900 as the date. Ahab, king of Israel, married Jezebel, daughter of Ithebal, king of Tyre, B. C. 918; Dido fled to Carthage on the death of Ithebal, and Æneas, according to Roman tradition, visited her on his flight from Troy, thus fixing the fall of that city at about B. C. 886. To our thinking it is more likely that the siege of Troy, or the great ten years' war between the Pelasgi of Asia Minor and the Hellenes of Greece, which has since received that name, took place considerably later than B. C. 1189 and not 1183, as Mr. Gladstone has it. Now this becomes important in attempting to determine the era of Homer. Mr. Gladstone infers from a passage in the *Iliad*,* wherein Neptune predicts that the grandchildren of Æneas shall reign in Troas, that the poet must have lived after the fulfilment of the prophecy, as he would not have ventured to put such a prediction into the god's mouth if he had not been sure of its accomplishment. A grandson of Æneas might have reigned there fifty years after the fall of Troy, and Homer might have been contemporary with him. The poet himself tells us that he was not an eye-witness of the war,† which would imply that he lived while it was going on, and would have been superfluous if he had lived a century or two afterwards. Then, again, he makes no mention of the conquest of the Peloponnesus by the Heraclidae, under Onylus, which is assigned to the year B. C. 1104, and it is hardly likely he would have omitted all allusion to an event so fatal to the kingdoms of Agamemnon, Menelaus, Diomed, Nestor, and others of his prominent heroes, if he had lived after its occurrence.

The internal evidence of the Homeric poems is in favor of the theory that they were written very soon after the close of the war, when many of those who took part in it were living to relate their own exploits, and those of their principal leaders. Mr. Gladstone is of this opinion, and con-

* Book i, v. 260--272.

† *Ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν, οὐδ' ἐτι ἴδμεν.* Book ii, v. 486.

jectures that Homer was familiar with many of the heroes themselves. He also sees in the poems, proof that the poet was intensely Greek in his ideas and feelings, and concludes from this that there is neither reason nor trustworthy authority for supposing him to have been an Asiatic Greek. There remains, however, the fact that

"Seven cities claimed the Homer dead,
Through which the living Homer begged his bread."

Four of these were Asiatics, viz.: Smyrna, Rhodes, Colophon, and Chios; the others, viz.: Athens, Argos, and Salamis, were purely Hellenic. Mr. Grote appears rather to incline to the claim of Smyrna.* Byron prefers Chios, and speaks of the

". immortal dreams that could beguile
The blind old man of Seio's rocky isle. †

The famous controversy respecting the authorship of the poems—whether the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were the work of one and the same man, and that man Homer—is very curiously treated by Mr Gladstone. He does not dispose of the argument of Wolf, that the poems are not genuine, because the art of writing did not exist at the time of their composition, and that poems of such length could not have been orally transmitted. He contents himself with admitting the force of the first objection, and evading the other, by observing that persons *have* lived who professed to be able to recite these poems, entire, from memory.

We confess to considerable misgivings on this point. A few such may possibly have existed, but to suppose that two such long poems, containing, between them, upwards of fifty thousand lines, could have been transmitted *verbatim*, from generation to generation, from the days of Homer to those of Pisistratus, king of Athens, who first collected them in a written form, about the year B.C. 535, is, in fact, to suppose an utter impossibility. How much has been lost, or added to them, it is now impossible to tell. Mr. Gladstone thinks that we have the poems substantially as they were composed, and that they have been but slightly tampered with.

* *History of Greece*, vol. 2, chap. 21.

† *The Bride of Abydos*, Canto 2. st. 2.

It seems surprising that he should have so feebly defended his idol, and that after elaborately commenting upon the influence which the Phœnicians had upon the nations inhabiting the shores of the Mediterranean, and demonstrating, as he has, the effect of the intercourse of the Achæians with that enterprising people, upon the religion, manners, and polity of the people of Greece, it should not have occurred to him that, as these Phœnicians possessed the art of recording events, they might have chronicled those of the Trojan war, which lasted so long, and extended over a large portion of Asia Minor, with which they traded.

The Egyptians, also, had the means of recording sentences as well as events. Why is it improbable that Homer became acquainted with one or other of such methods, and had a notation whereby he could transmit to the rhapsodists, who wandered about the world, reciting his poems, the language in which he expressed them, though no such notation has come down to us? Assuredly the rhapsodists had some means of aiding their memory, or they could not, as a body, have remembered entire poems, although one or two might have done so. The Greeks received their alphabet from the Phœnicians; why not the art of writing? It seems to us that Wolf's objection has been too readily allowed. The poems are so unique, so consistent in plot, so evidently the production of one man, and not of several; so commanding in genius, and so much in accordance with all we know of a half-pastoral, half-warlike, age, that they cannot have been invented, and improved upon from time to time, by the rhapsodists. It is to be regretted that Mr. Gladstone has not devoted more attention to this subject.

The author has bestowed much pains on the Pelasgi, the predecessors of the Greeks. No where have we met with so judicious and satisfactory an investigation of this obscure subject. It occupies the third chapter. The fact of the wide extension of that "mysterious people," as Bulwer calls them,* is well established. They were found in Asia Minor and in Thessaly, and they were one of the

* *History of Athens*, vol. 1. p. 9.

five nations which inhabited Crete. The European Pelasgi were allies of the Greeks; the Asiatic Pelasgi were allies of the Trojans. They spoke a language analogous to that spoken by both Greeks and Trojans, who could understand each other. Some of their deities were worshipped by both, and it was upon their ancient mythology that the Hellenic superstructure was raised. The Arcadians, and the pastoral population of Hellas, were essentially Pelasgic, and pre-Hellenic. They were conquered by the Hellenes, a Caucasian race, which, emigrating from the north of Asia Minor, spread themselves over that region, and crossed the Hellespont into Thrace, and thence into Thessaly and the Peloponnesus. Assuming the air of conquerors, they called themselves "Achaioi," by which term the dominant classes were subsequently known, and are so styled in the Homeric poems. They are also therein called "Argeioi" and "Danaoi." Mr. Gladstone shows that the former appellation was employed exclusively to designate those who were the warriors of the Greeks, while the latter was rather a poetic and archaic one, which had several generations previously been the proper designation of the inhabitants of the ruling portion of Greece.

The religion of the Pelasgi was of the order of nature-worship, but many of their old deities were thrown into obscurity, and superseded by the more anthropomorphic gods of the Hellenes; thus Saturn was dethroned by Jupiter. Oceanus, Uranus, Japetus, Hyperion, and the other Titans, gave place to Apollo, Minerva, and their compeers. In like manner the Hellenic names of places supplanted the Pelasgian nomenclature; and these, in their turn, became modified by the Achaians, the dominant order among the Hellenes or Helloi. Thus Hellas became converted into Achaia. But is it not going a little too far to deduce the name of Hellas, as Mr. Gladstone has done, from the word *σελασσειν* "to boast," because the Helloi (or Selloi), wherever they came, boasted of themselves as being antiochthomous or aboriginal inhabitants?

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the work is the fifth, which treats of the relations between the Greeks and

the Phœnicians and Egyptians. The Phœnicians, in those early times, monopolized the commerce of the ancient world, and it was from them that the Greeks heard of the wonders of Egypt, and the East; it was from them that they derived the rudiments of civilization. The Phœnicians were the most influential race in Crete, and Mr. Gladstone, after a close examination of the traditions respecting Minos, the king and law-giver of that island, has come to the conclusion that he was a Phœnician. The walls of Troy were built by Poseidon, who, as god of the sea, was the especial object of veneration among the Phœnicians. And it is in connection with Prætus, or Proitos, who was of that nation, that the first mention of writing occurs in the *Iliad*.* Memnon, who fought on the side of the Trojans, was an Egyptian, and Sarpedon, the bravest of their heroes, was of Phœnician extraction. Mr. Gladstone attempts to prove that Æolus, (alluded to in the tenth book of the *Odyssey*) was the Phœnician ancestor of the Æolidæ, and he thinks that the name has reference to the brilliant colors of the dresses worn by the Phœnicians. It is true that the word *Αἰόλος*, signifies "variagated," but it also signifies "various," "changeable," "swift," "nimble," and these may be characteristic of a man's disposition or power; the true meaning is still open to conjecture.

Much space is devoted to elucidating the phrase *Ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν*, so often applied to Agamemnon, and some half-dozen other chiefs in the *Iliad*. Mr. Gladstone argues that it was hereditary in certain families, and that it was an antique title of state, implying honor and sovereignty. It disappeared with the heroes of the *Iliad*, or with the conquest of the Peloponnesus by the Heraclidæ, when the old time-honored Achaian families, which had long borne sway there, succumbed to their Dorian conquerors. Whether there were any substantial prerogatives connected with this title of "King of Men," is uncertain; but it was enjoyed only by those who had not risen by any efforts of their own, but

* Πένπε δέ μιν Ἀγκίονδε, πορίν δ' ὄγε σήματα λυγρὰ
Γραψάς ἐν πίνακι πτυκτώ στυμφ Σορα πολλά

Book VI., v. 168, 169.

whose sires had borne it before them for centuries, being the earliest leaders of the nation. It was the possession of this dignity which gave Agamemnon and Menelaus precedence over Achilles, although the latter was in every respect their superior. Chapter the seventh treats of the Olympian system, "that splendid hierarchy of gods and goddesses, whose empire over the life and art of Hellas was so strong and vital, and whose beautiful and fictitious majesty has survived into all times and all languages."

It was Homer who created this system and made it the nation's creed. He took the floating faith of his day, a mixture of Pelasgic, Phœnician, Egyptian and Hellenic traditions, and blended them into one harmonious whole. It became the inspiration of Greece. Mr. Gladstone maintains that Homer, in stamping, as he did, the functions and orders of human society upon the gods,—in imagining the the divine community as a human one apotheosized, yet in all respects of like passions; though boundless in power, yet beyond the reach of death or change—he crystallized the anthropomorphic idea as the inmost thought of Greek existence, and by providential commission, gave to Greece her task of working out the conception of Heaven, interpreted by earth, which Phidias subsequently expressed in his Pallas, carved in gold and ivory, and Praxiteles developed in his Aphrodité. This system was not based upon authority of any kind, or on revelation, but owed its identity, popularity, and enduring quality, simply to its beauty. It is wonderful that it should have existed for so many ages with such slight claims to the homage of mankind.

The best writing in the "*Juventus Mundi*" occurs in this chapter. Mr. Gladstone thinks that he finds in Homer distinct revelations of those larger truths which the Hebrews had become possessed of. He traces, 1: A deliverer conceived under the double form, first of the seed of the woman, a being at once divine and human; and secondly of the logos, the word, or wisdom of God. 2. The woman whose seed the Redeemer was to be. 3. The rainbow, considered as a means, or a sign, of communication between God and man. 4. The tradition of an evil being, together with his

ministers, a rebel and a tempter. The first of these is prefigured in Apollo, and Pallas—brother and sister—the offspring of the woman, represented by Latona. The third is Iris; the fourth, Ate, and the giants, who were precipitated into Tartarus.

To us this appears rather far-fetched. Apollo was a destroyer as well as a deliverer, and it is preposterous to combine him with Minerva in order to make up a "Son of God." The other resemblances are mere coincidences. Besides, all the gods and goddesses are guilty of wicked actions and are actuated by such purely human motives that it is difficult to detect their divinity. In the Homeric view of the future life, Mr. Gladstone finds a threefold division of the unseen world, in some kind of correspondence with the christian, and what may have been the patriarchal tradition, as in the retributive character of the future state, and the continuance of the habits and propensities acquired on earth.

It would be pleasant to follow him through his investigation into the manners and morality of the heroic age of Greece; the condition of women at the time of the Trojan war, and the political and civil economies of the period; the generic differences between the Greeks and the Trojans; the geography of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; the character of the actors in the poems; and the arithmetic, art, aesthetics, and physical science of that age.

But our space is nearly filled. We may conclude by pointing out Mr. Gladstone as an instance that men do not die of hard work, but rather of rust and stagnation. Strong minds cannot be idle; they find repose in change, not in inaction. Their very rest is active and creative; and their truest recreation is the pleasure they feel in work done well, whether it be a great measure of state policy, or a book of deep and earnest study.

ART. VIII.—1. *Cosmos. A Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe.* By ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT. Translated from

* chap. x. † chap. xi. ‡ chap. xii. § chap. xiii. ¶ chap. xiv.

the German, by E. C. OTTÉ. In 5 vols. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1869.

2. *History of Physical Astronomy, from the earliest ages to the middle of the nineteenth century.* By ROBERT GRANT, F.R.A.S. 1 vol., 8vo. London. 1852.
3. *Annuaire Publié par le Bureau des Longitudes pour l'Année.* 1846.

AMONG all the recurring phenomena of nature, there are none, perhaps, that have attracted more general attention than solar and lunar eclipses. In the infant state of science, among all nations, they seem rather to have been regarded as the indication of the wrath of an offended Deity, than as the result of the operation of the immutable laws of nature. Indeed, what could be more appalling to the ignorant and superstitious mind, than the intercepting of the sun's light by an unknown object, without the least warning! Not only so, but to the astronomer who is well acquainted with the laws which produce them, an eclipse of the sun or moon is an evidence of the existence of the unspent forces operating in the celestial regions, that teach him how feeble is man's power when put in comparison with them. The scene presented by a total eclipse of the sun, is rendered still more impressive by the circumstances attending so remarkable an occurrence. All nature seems hushed into silence, as if night had suddenly fallen upon the earth in the midst of day. "The heavens assume an unnatural aspect, which excites a feeling of horror in the spectator; a livid hue is diffused over all terrestrial objects; the plants close up their leaves, as on the approach of night; the fowls betake themselves to their resting-places; the warbling of the grove is hushed in profound silence. Universal nature seems to have relaxed her energies, as if the pulse which stimulated her mighty movements had, all at once, stood still."

An eclipse, in general terms, is caused by the interposition of an opaque body between a luminous object and the body, or part of the body illuminated. In astronomy, it is tech-

nically the occasional passage of the moon between the sun and the earth, which produces a solar eclipse; and the falling of the moon into the earth's shadow, thereby producing a lunar eclipse. The first recorded eclipses, so far as yet known, are those of the moon, and they were observed by the Chaldeans, in the years 720 and 719, B.C.* We are informed by Simplicius, in his Commentary on the second book of Aristotle's work, *De Cælo*, that, after Alexander's conquest of Babylon, Callisthenes sent to Aristotle a catalogue of eclipses, which, it was said, had been observed at that place during a period of 1903 years antecedent to that time. The catalogue is now lost; but the above statement shows how attentively such celestial phenomena were watched for ages, probably, before man was able to predict them. But man's desire to penetrate into the future, doubtless stimulated him to great efforts to foretell when such interesting phenomena would occur. A careful observation of the motions of the sun and moon, and their relative positions during eclipses, extending through many years, would probably be required, to enable the ancient astronomer to satisfy himself as to the true cause of solar and lunar eclipses; and, after this was done, they could not be *calculated* until solar and lunar tables of the motions of those bodies were formed. It would be interesting to know who was the first astronomer that succeeded in solving this great problem. According to Diodorus Siculus, the explanation of eclipses of the sun, given by the Chaldeans, was so defective, that they were unable to predict them; but there is some evidence that they were in possession of means of calculating lunar eclipses.†

We are informed by Herodotus‡ that Thales, the celebrated Grecian philosopher, predicted an eclipse of the sun, which put an end to an engagement between the Medes and Lydians, and induced them to listen to propositions of peace, which were made by Syennesis, of Cilicia, and Labynetus, of Babylon. Herodotus does not enter into particulars;

* *Origin and Progress of Astronomy*, by John Narrien, p. 71.

† *Bibliotheca Historica*, Lib. II.

‡ *Clio*, sect. 74.

and we are uncertain as to the accuracy with which the time of the eclipse was foretold by Thales; and also with respect to the means employed in arriving at his conclusions. The cycle of eighteen years, known as the *saoros*, a knowledge of which Thales might have obtained from the priests while he was travelling in Egypt, was sufficient to enable him, as observed by Delambre, to predict the time of the phenomenon within a month. Two other eclipses are said to have been predicted by the ancient Greek astronomers; one by Eudemus, who wrote a history of astronomy, now supposed to be lost; and the other by Helicon, of Cyzicene, who announced to King Dionysius the time of its occurrence, and it is said to have happened conformably to the prediction.*

The *saoros* is a Chaldean period of about eighteen years, which was discovered by that people many centuries before the beginning of our era, by means of a comparison of the eclipses observed and recorded during many years; and it was used by them and by other nations for predicting such phenomena. It consists in this: 223 mean lunations consist of 6,585,321 days, and the moon's nodes return to the same position, with respect to the sun, in 6,585,772 days, giving only the small difference 0.451 of a day, or not quite twelve hours. We thus see that the relative position of the sun, moon, and node is nearly the same at the end of this period,† as at the beginning; and any eclipse happening at the commencement of a period will be *nearly* repeated at the beginning of the succeeding one. There is too great a variation, however, to count on the recurrence of a *total* solar eclipse at the same place.

Eclipses of the sun, it is well known, depend for their occurrence on the relative position of the sun, moon, and node of the lunar orbit. It has been found, by calculation, that for a solar eclipse to be possible, the distance of the centres of the sun and moon from the moon's node, must not exceed $18^{\circ} 36'$; and the greatest possible distance between the centres of the sun and moon, at the time of

* Aristotle's *De Cælo*, Lib. II., cap. vi.

† 18y., 10d., 7h., 43m.

contact, is $1^{\circ} 34' 28''$. These are the solar ecliptic limits. Out of seventy eclipses which annually occur within one cycle of eclipses, or *saros*, the average number of solar eclipses is forty-one, and of lunar twenty-nine. We learn, from theory, that seven eclipses *may*, and that two *must* take place within every year. When the number of eclipses is least, they are both of the sun; and when the number of eclipses in a year is greatest, five may be solar and two lunar, or three solar and four lunar. The average number of eclipses is four. Although it is usually stated that, in any given long period, the number of solar eclipses exceeds the number of lunar, yet, if we take into consideration the *penumbral* lunar eclipses, as we do the penumbral solar eclipses, there will be more eclipses of the moon, by a small number, than of the sun.[†]

Although a solar eclipse may last several hours, counting from the beginning to the end of the observation, yet the duration of a total or annular eclipse is very limited. Other things being equal, the duration of a total solar eclipse varies with the latitude of the place of observation, being greatest at the equator. According to the calculations of Du Sejour, the greatest possible duration of a total eclipse of the sun, is, under the equator, $7' 58''$, and $6' 10''$ in the latitude of Paris.[‡] This takes place when the moon is in perigee, of the sun in apogee, when the difference in the diameters is $2' 2''$; § but since the sun's apparent motion is least, and that of the moon greatest, at these points, the duration of totality is necessarily quite limited. The duration of an annular eclipse is greatest when the sun is in perigee and the moon in apogee; and since the apparent motion of the sun is greatest, and that of the moon least, and the difference of their apparent diameters equal to $3' 28''$ || at these points, every circumstance conspires to increase the duration of such an eclipse. Du Sejour found, by actual

* Bartlett's *Spherical Astronomy*, p. 333.

† *Month. Notices R. A. S.*, vol. xxviii., p. 240.

‡ *Mémoires Acad. des Sciences*, 1777, p. 318.

§ Bartlett's *Spher. Ast.*, p. 333.

|| P. 333.

calculation, that the utmost possible duration of an annular eclipse is, at the equator, $12^{\circ} 24''^{1/2}$ and in the latitude of Paris, $8^{\circ} 56''^{\dagger}$.

The great use which the astronomer makes of eclipses, not to mention the public interest generally excited by their prediction and appearance, called the attention of the astronomer at an early period, into the field of investigation, and several methods of calculation have been adopted by different authors, at various periods. Among all the methods, the plan of orthographic projection, for the general circumstances which take place on the earth, seems to have been the most popular, though it only affords a close approximation. In actual calculations, however, its convenience seems to have inclined astronomers, hitherto, almost exclusively, to use it, when the greatest accuracy was not required.*

The circumstances of an eclipse for a particular place, calculated by the "Method of the nonagesimal," which refers the bodies to the ecliptic, were discussed analytically by Lagrange, in the "*Astronomische Jahrbuch*" for 1782; and since then the celebrated Bessel has made many important additions to the theory.‡ In the English "*Nautical Almanac*" for 1836, Mr. W. S. B. Woolhouse has given an elaborate paper on the calculation of eclipses, discussing all the various circumstances; and then he has applied his formula to the annular eclipse of May the 15th, 1836.

Eclipses have ever been regarded as very important phenomena in the systems of the world, since their accurate observation enables the astronomer to test the accuracy of his theory, and of his solar and lunar tables. They are very important, also, and especially eclipses of the sun, for the determination of terrestrial longitude. Eclipses are also of the first importance in the science of chronology, for the purpose of fixing dates as landmarks, or mile-stones, in the

* *Mémoires Acad. des Sciences*, 1777, p. 317. † *Ibid.*, p. 316.

‡ The reader will find this method treated in the astronomical treatises of M. De la Lande, J. M. Delambre, and more recently in the *Elementa Eclipsium* of Hallaschka, Prague, 1816. See also, *Mémoires sur l'Astronomie Pratique* by M. J. Monteiro Da Rocha, Paris, 1808.

§ See *Astron. Nachrichten*, No. 151.

history of the world. Among the eclipses of this character we may mention the following:—The one mentioned by Herodotus, already referred to. This eclipse is alluded to by several other ancient writers, who flourished subsequently to Herodotus. This author does not state *when* the eclipse occurred; but Cicero and Pliny assert that it happened in the 4th year of the 48th Olympiad, which corresponds to the year 585 B.C. This eclipse has given rise to a good deal of discussion among calculators. Riccioli and Newton, and various other modern writers, adopt the date mentioned above. Scaliger, however, found, by actual calculation, that it happened on the 1st of October, 583 B.C. Archbishop Usher placed it in the year 601 B.C.; and Bayer and Costard think that Herodotus refers to a total solar eclipse which it was formerly thought happened in the year 603 B.C. But any solution of the question, based on actual computation by means of the solar and lunar tables, previously to the publication of the recent accurate lunar tables by M. Hansen, and the corrections of other theories by Peirce and Longstreth; and the solar tables of Hansen and Olufsen were necessarily imperfect, and could only give approximate results. Baily's solution, in 1811, was considered for many years, however, as having decided the question.* He began by skillfully criticising the original passage in which the Grecian historian alludes to the eclipse of Thales, and he concluded that it could not have happened earlier than 629 B.C., nor later than 595 B.C. Out of seventy eclipses which happened in that period, he found only one that was total in the peninsula of Asia Minor, and that he fixed on the 30th of September, 610 B.C.* It has more recently been discovered, however, that the secular motion of the moon's node, used in the calculations, was erroneous by more than a minute and a half, and Professor Airy has shown that the eclipse occurred 584 B.C., May the 28th, thus confirming the statements of Cicero and Pliny. Hence we see how the secular variations of the elements of the moon's orbit are connected with our knowledge of important ancient celestial phenomena.

* *Phil. Trans.*, 1811, p. 220, *et seq.*

Herodotus also mentions another eclipse,* when Cyaxares was at war with the Lydians, "when the engagement, which happened in the day, was suddenly interrupted by nocturnal darkness." The father of history also mentions a solar eclipse, which happened when Xerxes was advancing with his army from Sardis to Abydos. "At the moment of their departure, the sun, which before gave his full light, in a bright, unclouded atmosphere, withdrew his beams, and the darkest night succeeded."† The date of this last eclipse has been referred to 480, B.C.‡ Professor Airy thinks, however, that it was not a solar eclipse, but a total eclipse of the moon, which, it appears, took place March 19th, 478 B.C.

Xenophon mentions an eclipse of the sun, which led to the capture of Larrisa by the Persians. During the retreat, which was conducted by Xenophon, the Greeks passed "a large deserted city, called Larissa, formerly inhabited by the Medes. Its walls were twenty-five feet thick, and a hundred feet high; its circumference two parasangs; it was built of burnt brick, on a foundation of stone, twenty feet high. When the Persians conquered the Medes, the Persian king besieged this city, but was unable to capture it till a cloud hid the sun wholly from view, when the inhabitants withdrew in great fear, and the city was captured." The Greeks, after passing Larissa, reached another deserted city, called Mespila. Layard, in his researches in Assyria, identified Larissa with the modern Nimroud;§ and Mespila with the ruins opposite the modern Mosul.|| Professor Airy has shown that this eclipse happened May 19th, 556 B.C.

It is not a little curious, how frequently eclipses are associated with important undertakings among ancient nations. Thus a total eclipse of the sun, supposed to have taken place August 3d, 430 B.C.,* seriously threatened the success of the expedition of the Athenians under Pericles. He manned a hundred and fifty ships, and was preparing to set sail. "The Athenians conceived good hopes of success, and the enemy

* Book I., sect. 93.† Book VII., sect. 37. ‡ Grant's *Hist. Phys. Ast.*, p. 367.

§ *Nineveh and its Remains*, vol. I., p. 27. || *Ibid.*, vol. II., p. 196 and 218.

* Hind's *Solar System*, p. 102

no less dreaded so great an armament. The whole fleet was in readiness, and Pericles on board of his own galley, when there happened an eclipse of the sun. This sudden darkness was looked upon as an unfavorable omen, and threw them into the greatest consternation. Pericles, observing that the pilot was much astonished and perplexed, took his cloak, and, having covered his eyes with it, asked him, if he found anything so terrible in that, or considered it a sad presage. Upon his answering in the negative, he said: 'Where is the difference, then, between this and the other except that something bigger than my cloak causes the eclipse?' * Although it is evident that Pericles had some knowledge of the cause of the eclipse, it does not appear that it had been predicted.

Among the solar eclipses of antiquity, that known as the eclipse of Agathocles has given rise to as much trouble as almost any other. We are informed by Diodorus Siculus, that the voyage to Africa, from Syracuse occupied six days, and that, on the second day, an eclipse occurred, during which the darkness was so complete, that the stars became visible in all directions. The eclipse was, therefore, total. Neither the date nor the locality was open to much doubt, or uncertainty, and the phenomena, therefore, seemed to Mr. Francis Baily to afford a favorable opportunity for checking the solar and lunar tables, instead of using them to settle the date and limits of the eclipse. He found an irreconcilable difference of 180 geographical miles between the tables and the historical statement in regard to the most southerly position that can be assigned to the fleet of Agathocles, and the limit of the total phase. "To obviate this difference," says Hind, † "it is only necessary to suppose an error of about three minutes of arc in the computed distance of the centres of the sun and moon at conjunction—a very inconsiderable correction for a date anterior to the epoch of the tables by more than twenty-one centuries." Professor Airy has been more successful, by founding his calculations on improved lunar tables; and he has shown

* Plutarch's *Lives*—Pericles, p. 126; Langham's Translation.

† *Solar System*, p. 102.

that the limits of the zone of totality were such, that Agathocles might have been involved in the moon's shadow, during his passage.

According to Philastratus,* the death of the Roman emperor, Domitian, was previously announced by a celestial phenomenon, which appears to have been an eclipse of the sun; and we mention it here because the account of it probably contains the earliest record of which we have any account, of a phenomenon accompanying total solar eclipses, that has of late years attracted much attention. We refer to the luminous ring, or corona, surrounding the moon during totality. "In the heavens," he says, "there appeared a prodigy of this nature; a certain corona, resembling the Iris, surrounded the orb of the sun, and obscured his light." This eclipse occurred in the year 95 A. D. Many other total solar eclipses are recorded to have happened during years intervening from 237 to 1113 of our era, but they require no further mention here.

Sir Edmund Halley communicated to the Royal Society a paper on the total eclipse of the sun, which happened at London, on the 3d of May, 1715,† and in it he alludes to the fact, without indicating very clearly whence he derived his information, that there had not occurred before then another total eclipse of the same body, visible in that city, since the 20th of March, 1140 A. D.—a period of 575 years—so infrequently are total eclipses of the sun visible from any particular locality on the earth. A notice of the last-mentioned eclipse occurs, however, in the section of the "Saxon Chronicle" which relates to the year 1140: "In the Lent, the sun and the day darkened about the noontide of the day, when men were eating; and they lighted candles to eat by. That was the thirteenth day before the calends of April. Men were very much struck with wonder."‡

On the 17th of June, 1433, a remarkable total solar eclipse happened, which was visible in Scotland, and the time of its occurrence was long remembered by the people of that

* *Life of Apollonius.*

† *Phil. Trans.*, 1715, p. 245, *et seq.*

‡ *Saxon Chronicle*, p. 371 of Ingram's translation.

country as the *black hour*. According to Maclaurin, the celebrated mathematician, a manuscript account of it is preserved in the library of the university of Edinburgh. It is there stated that it took place about three o'clock in the afternoon, and that the darkness was so complete that nothing was visible—a statement that is evidently exaggerated, since the absence of the sun in the night does not produce such an effect. The eclipse, however, was one of a very unusual kind, since Maclaurin found, by calculation, that, at the time of its occurrence, the sun was only 2° from his apogee, and the moon not more than 13° from perigee.*

In the year 1598, there occurred a total eclipse of the sun, which was visible in the British Isles. The moon's shadow passed over the border countries of England and Scotland, and the day of the eclipse was long remembered, in both countries, as "black Saturday." In 1652, there was another total eclipse of the sun visible in Great Britain and Ireland. Dr. Wyberd observed it at Carrickfergus, in the north of Ireland,† and in Scotland, the day of its occurrence, gave rise, among the common people, to the expression "mirk Monday," and it is even still used in some parts of that country, although the eclipse was long ago forgotten.

On the 24th of September, 1699, there occurred a total eclipse in the north of Europe, and a correspondent of the Royal Society, writing from Leipsic, where it was almost total, says that when ten digits were covered, "the sky, being otherwise very clear, began to appear of a more livid, or wan, complexion, and more sad than it usually looks, with a clear sky, when the sun is set, or below the horizon." He adds, that "the cocks, which had before crowed very frequently, left off crowing, and went to roost, and they did not renew it till, by the recovery of the sun's light, they had recovered their former gaity and mirth."‡ Souville, in his account of the eclipse of 1715, mentions the same thing.

Until the year 1706, solar eclipses seem to have attracted no further attention than the observation of their ordinary

* *Phil. Trans.*, 1737, p. 134.

† Wing's *Astronomia Britannica*, p. 355. ‡ *Phil. Trans.*, 1700, p. 624.

phenomena, and nothing that will serve as a basis of any physical investigations; but, on the 12th of May, of the last-mentioned year, there happened a total eclipse of the sun, which was observed at several places in Europe by astronomers who gave more particular attention to its effect on animals, and to the appearances presented by the sun and moon. At Montpellier, where it was observed by MM. Plantade and Capiés, the total obscuration lasted 4' 10". The corona of light around the moon was observed; and the planets Venus, Mercury, and Saturn; Aldebaran and several other of the fixed stars were observed by the naked eye. "The bats flew about as at dusk; the fowls and pigeons betook themselves in great haste to their resting-places; the little birds, which sung in cages, were silent, and put their heads under their wings; the animals, which were at labor, stood still."* In several parts of the city of Geneva, "there were seen persons prostrate on the ground, and offering up prayers, under the impression that the last day had come."†

During the total eclipses of the sun of the 22d of May, 1724, and of the 2d of May, 1733, the corona, or luminous circle, around the moon, was distinctly seen. Several of the planets and the larger stars were visible to the naked eye. During the last-mentioned eclipse, "three or four spots, of a reddish color, were also perceived near the limb of the moon, but not in immediate contact with it."‡

On the 24th of June, 1778, there occurred a total solar eclipse, which was observed at sea by Don Antonio Ulloa, the Spanish Admiral, while passing from the Azores to Cape St. Vincent.§ The period of totality was four minutes. The luminous ring around the moon presented an appearance that was very beautiful. Before it became very conspicuous the stars of the second magnitude were distinctly visible; but after attaining its greatest brilliancy it obscured all but those of the first. "The darkness was such, that persons who had been asleep in the afternoon, having awoke, imagined, to their

* *Mem. Acad. des Sciences*, 1706, p. 113. † *Phil. Trans.*, 1706, p. 2241.

‡ *Phil. Trans.*, 1733, p. 135. § *Phil. Trans.*, 1779, p. 195, *et seq.*

great astonishment, that the night was already far advanced. The fowls, birds, and other animals on board, took their usual positions for sleeping, as if it had been night." The total obscuration commenced at three o'clock forty-four minutes in the afternoon.

A total eclipse occurred on the 16th of June, 1806, which was visible in this country. The Spanish astronomer, Don Joachim Ferrers observed it at Kinderhook, state of New York. The period of totality was 4' 37". The corona was visible. Professor Olmsted says that during this eclipse, "which was one of the most remarkable on record, the time of total darkness, as seen by him, was about mid-day. The sky was entirely cloudless, but as the period of total obscuration approached, a gloom pervaded all nature. When the sun was wholly lost sight of, planets and stars came into view; a fearful pall hung upon the sky, unlike both to night and to twilight; and the temperature of the air rapidly declining, a sudden chill came over the earth. Even the animal tribes exhibited tokens of fear and agitation."* There was a slight fall of dew during total obscuration.

Several large eclipses of the sun occurred from 1830 to 1840, but the next great solar eclipse which deserves our attention is that which took place on the 8th of July, 1842. It so rarely happens that the astronomer has an opportunity of witnessing so sublime a celestial phenomenon as a total eclipse of the sun by remaining in any particular place,† that he has, especially of late years, removed as nearly as practicable to the central line of totality, there to make his observations. As the total eclipse of 1842 was approaching, an intense interest was excited, and astronomers from most parts of Europe betook themselves to those localities suitable for observation, over which calculations had shown that the moon's shadow was to pass. The eclipse was total to parts of Italy, France, Germany, and Russia. M. Arago observed it at Pepignan, and he has given a very fine description of

* *Astronomy*, p. 161.

† We have already stated that 575 years passed before another total solar eclipse was visible at London after that of the year 1140.

what he saw, but it has been too frequently quoted for us to reproduce it here.* M. Valz was at Marseilles; the late Mr. Baily, at Pavia; Professor Airy, astronomer royal, was at the Superga, near Turin; MM. Otto Struve and Schiellowsky, at Lipesk; and various others at other places.

The period of totality during this eclipse, was comparatively short, being not quite two and a half minutes at several of the places, and only $3' 5''$ at Lipesk.† Besides the phenomena to which we have referred as having been seen during former total eclipses of the sun—the luminous ring around the moon, and the effect on terrestrial things—rose-colored protuberances were seen, which seemed to be projected out from the margin of the sun's disk. Professor Airy says: "The appearance of the moon can never be forgotten. It was like a deep black disk fixed in the heavens, and surrounded by a brilliant luminous ring, whose breadth was estimated at about one-eighth the diameter of the moon. The color of this ring was nearly white, in my judgment inclining a little to a reddish hue, while its illuminating power was very great."‡ But the most wonderful circumstances, says Mr. Francis Baily, "in connection with this appearance, was the outbursting of three large protuberances from the edge of the moon, yet evidently a part of the crown of light. They had the appearance of *mountains* of considerable heights. Their color was red, changing to violet and purple, and perhaps better represented by the color of the peach blossom. They resembled the snow-capped summits of the Alps when illuminated by the rays of the rising or the setting sun. In another respect, they resembled the tops of the Alps, inasmuch as the light was quite steady, while the other part of the crown was rapidly flickering."§

All the other observers of the total eclipse, saw the same, or nearly the same things, and described them in similar

* *Annuaire* for 1846, p. 303.

† For information respecting this eclipse, see volume xiv. of the *Memoirs of the Royal Astr. Society*; volume iv. of the *Giornali dell' Instituto Lombardo*; Nos. 457 and 470 of the *Astronomisch Nachrichten*, and the *Annuaire* for 1846.

‡ Professor O. M. Mitchel's *Sidereal Messenger*, vol. I. p. 24.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 24 and 25.

terms. Our observer states that "the thin crescent of light was suddenly changed to a line of luminous points, which appeared to wave from the extremities to the centre of the crescent, like 'a device in gas swept over by a strong breeze;'"* and other observers have seen more or less perfectly similar phenomena.

During total eclipses of the sun, the moon's disk is sometimes faintly illuminated by a doubtful kind of light, during the totality; and on one occasion spots were distinctly observed by Vassenius at Gottenberg.† Both M. Arago and Professor Airy state that the moon's disk was uniformly illumined during the eclipse of 1842, but though they sought diligently for irregularities on the lunar surface, they could see none. In 1806, however, irregularities were noticed by Ferreré.‡

The light which renders the moon visible on such occasions, undoubtedly is the sunlight reflected from the earth, as it renders visible the moon's disk when the part directly illuminated is but a slender crescent. This is the explanation given of it by Kepler.§ This *lumière cendrée*, as the French term it, or ash-colored light, comes from the sun to the earth, is reflected to the moon, and thence reflected to the earth. The fact that sometimes it renders the irregularities of the moon's surface visible, and sometimes not, shows us that its intensity is variable, being sometimes interfered with by what M. Arago calls the *lumière atmosphérique*.

A curious phenomenon was noticed at Washington by Mr. F. R. Hassler, during the progress of the partial eclipse of the sun, of February 12th, 1831. He saw the inequalities upon the moon distinctly painted "by the reflected light and shade upon its disk, and presenting apparently elevations brilliantly illuminated, and intervals shaded in an ash-colored shade, more or less dark and distinct, as they were nearer to or farther from the sun, the edge of the moon toward the sun being always fully dark."¶ The appearance began when about one-eighth of the sun's diameter was immersed, ex-

* Hind's *Solar System*, p. 94.

† *Phil. Trans.* 1733, p. 135.

‡ *Trans. Amer. Phil. Society*, vol. vi., p. 267. § *Epit. Astronomiæ*, p. 895.

¶ *Trans. Am. Phil. Soc.*, New Series, vol. iv., p. 131.

tended itself with some variations to about one-third of the moon's diameter, and then faded into indistinctness, and the whole of the moon's disk appeared equally dark. The same phenomenon was repeated in an inverted order toward the end of the eclipse.

No very satisfactory explanation has been given of this singular phenomenon. Grant thinks it may possibly be owing to the action of the *lumière cendrée* and the *lumière atmosphérique*.* Arago noticed a somewhat similar phenomenon during the eclipse of 1842. Forty minutes after the commencement of the eclipse, while a considerable portion of the sun was still visible, he observed the dark contour of the moon projected upon the bright sky. It corresponded exactly with that portion of the moon visible upon the sun's disk.† M. Arago thinks this phenomenon is owing to the projection of the moon upon the solar atmosphere, "the brightness of which, by an effect of contrast, rendered the outline of the moon's dark limbs discernible."

The next great eclipse of the sun occurred on the 28th of July, 1851. The phenomena observed during the total eclipse of 1842, had awakened in the minds of astronomers a great deal of interest, and the total eclipse of 1851 was looked to with much interest. The line of totality passed through Norway and Sweden, whither several English and American astronomers repaired to observe the phenomenon. The late Professor Bond was stationed at Lilla Edet, in Sweden. He says that "the contour of the lunar mountains was exhibited in great beauty. Towards the south side, they were quite high enough to produce a visible distortion of the cusps."‡ He gave his attention more especially to the south cusp; and just before the eclipse was total this cusp "was divided into beads of light, which moved slowly toward the point of the cusp, and disappeared." He thinks the appearance is such as could not be accounted for by the mountains on the moon's edge.† On removing the screen, after totality had commenced, he says that he "was filled with inexpressible

* *Hist. Phys. Ast.*, p. 402, note.

† *Annuaire*, 1846, p. 372.

‡ *Gould's Ast. Jour.*, vol. ii., p. 49.

§ *Ibid*

admiration at the glorious spectacle of the corona, and the prominences of rose-colored flame, which surrounded the moon. The appearance of the corona is not so well described by calling it a ring, or halo of light, as by comparing it to the 'glory' or 'aureola,' employed by painters to designate the person of the Saviour." It seemed to extend from the moon's edge over a space about equal to that of the sun's semi-diameter, though its external outlines were rather indefinite. Its light was pure white.

Professor Bond was absolutely certain that the corona was visible on the moon's limb after the sun's limb had reappeared. He saw several prominences, some on the side of the moon's advance, and others on the opposite side. "The color of all was a decided rose, or pinkish-carmine; like the roseate hue of auroral streamers, but far more intense." He says that all the prominences "had rather the appearance of flames, not in sudden motion, than of mountains, or of solid projections from the sun, to which they seemed to belong rather than to the moon."^{*}

Mr. John Russell Hind has given us a very beautiful description of terrestrial phenomena, as they appeared during the period of totality, which lasted only 1' 40" near Engelholm, in Sweden, where he observed. We quote it here :†

"The aspect of nature during the total eclipse was grand beyond description. A diminution over the earth was perceptible a quarter of an hour after the beginning of the eclipse, and about ten minutes before the extinction of the sun the gloom increased very perceptibly. The distant hills looked dull and misty, and the sea assumed a dusky appearance, like that which it presents during rain. The daylight that remained had a yellowish tinge, and the azure blue of the sky deepened to a purplish-violet hue, particularly towards the north. But, notwithstanding those gradual changes, the observer could hardly be prepared for the wonderful spectacle that presented itself when he withdrew his eye from the telescope, after the totality had come on, to gaze around him for a few seconds. The southern heavens were then of a uniform purple-gray color, the only indication of the sun's position being the luminous corona, the light of which contrasted strikingly with that of the surrounding sky. In the zenith, and north of it, the heavens were

* *Astron. Jour.*, vol. ii., p. 59.

† Hind's *Solar System*, pp. 99-100.

of a purplish-violet, and appeared very near, while in the northwest and the northeast broad bands of yellowish-crimson light, intensely bright, produced an effect which no person who witnessed it can ever forget. The crimson appeared to run over large portions of the sky in these directions, irrespective of the clouds. At higher altitudes the predominant color was purple. All nature seemed to be overshadowed by an unnatural gloom; the distant hills were hardly visible; the sea turned lurid red, and persons standing near the observer had a pale, livid look, calculated to produce the most painful sensations. The darkness, if it can be so termed, had no resemblance to that of night."

The predicted and observed boundaries of the shadow in this eclipse accorded very closely. Dr. B. A. Gould (Sen.) says that "the vessels passing through the sound by Elsinore saw the Swedish coast on the outside in the gloom of deep shadow, while Denmark, opposite, was glowing in bright sunlight."*

On the 7th of September, 1858, there occurred a total eclipse of the sun, in which the whole shadow of the moon passed obliquely across South America, a few degrees south of the equator. The late Captain J. M. Gilliss went to Olmos, in Peru, a small town in the outer range of the Andes, where he observed the eclipse nearly in the centre line of the totality. The whole period of totality there was but sixty and a half seconds. The eclipse took place in the morning, the middle of the eclipse being about half-past seven, and the prospect was at first unfavorable, owing to the presence of clouds, which prevented the beginning of the eclipse from being observed.

Before the beginning of totality, by twelve or fifteen seconds, the entire lune, then perhaps 35° in extent, broke up into masses of unequal length, showing detached portions wholly separated from the rest by dark lines. The suddenness of the occurrence was such as to startle him. Within the following ten seconds the remaining visible fragments had become brilliant globules, of nearly equal size, but they differed from Baily's beads, as seen by him during the annular eclipse of September, 1838, by the darker spaces which separated them from one another.

* *Astron. Jour.*, vol. ii., p. 51

When the total obscuration commenced, four luminous clouds immediately became visible on different parts of the moon's circumference. Circumstances did not permit him to decide which one was first recognised. All the phenomena were distinctly visible with the naked eye, as he perceived while removing the screen from the telescope. One of the clouds, or protuberances, was thirty seconds of arc in height, and occupied more than 30° of the lunar circumference. The highest of them was as much as one minute, or one minute and ten seconds, in altitude, above the margin of the lunar disk. A marked peculiarity of these clouds, as seen from that station, was the absence of rose or pink color, "but they all resembled irregular masses of illuminated clouds of leaden hue, fringed with bright light, more especially at the edges furthest from the sun." Lieut. Gilliss was surprised at the absence of any red color, and thinking that his physical condition might have some influence, he requested Mr. Raymond, his assistant, to carefully note the color of the protuberances, and he says that they appeared to be of nearly "the same color as the corona, making it look more intensely bright. There was no pink or red colour exhibited." At Payta, however, the French observers saw them "of a bright rose color."

The corona of light flashed out at the moment of totality. He says that it extended farthest from the sun, in lines drawn from the centre, through the protuberances, but it did not extend anywhere beyond $15'$ or $16'$ from the margin of the lunar disk. "It was a far more imposing sight," says Lieut. Gilliss, "without, than with the telescope, and long as has been my experience in the observation of celestial phenomena, and calm and unimpassioned, at such times, as my temperament has become, the sublime majesty of the scene thrilled me with excitement and humble reverence." It had a similar influence on two citizens of Clino, who stood within a few feet of him, watching with deep interest the gradual decrease of light. At the instant of total obscuration one of them exclaimed in terror, "*La Gloria!*" and both fell to their knees, "filled with awe." The darkness of totality was not

great, for Lieut. Gilliss made all his sketches without the aid of artificial light.*

On the 18th of July, 1860, there occurred a total eclipse of the sun, which was rather remarkable for the extent of the earth's surface throughout which it was visible. The sun rose eclipsed in the western part of the United States, and the zone of totality passed over British America, traversed Spain from north to south, passed thence into Algiers, and disappeared in the interior of Africa. Astronomers in America, and in most parts of Europe, placed themselves in the path of the moon's total shadow, for the purpose of observing so sublime a phenomenon, and from which they expected to derive much important information in relation to the physical constitution of our great central luminary.

In this country two expeditions were fitted out, one by the United States government and the Coast Survey, conjointly, which proceeded to Labrador, on the east coast of North America; and the other by the Coast Survey, and sent to Washington Territory, in the west part of the United States. The first party, under the direction of Professor Alexander, of the College of New Jersey, were prevented by unfavorable weather from making satisfactory observations on the eclipse.†

The other expedition, in charge of Lieut. Gilliss, went to a station near Steilacoom, and was more fortunate. The remarkable character of Lieut. Gilliss' observations, renders a somewhat detailed account of them necessary. The sun rose eclipsed about half-past four in the morning. After totality had begun he could see the following segment of the moon through an arc of 100° or more. "Its color was uniformly shaded, from an intense black at the centre, to a dark-grayish purple on the western border, and for the first time in my life," says Lieut. Gilliss, "the moon was visible in its true form—a sphere, and *not* a disc."‡

At the moment of totality, beads of golden and ruby-

* *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, vol. vi., Total Eclipse of the Sun, Sept. 7, 1858, pp. 7-11.

† *Coast Survey Report for 1860*, pp. 229-275.

‡ *Coast Survey Report for 1860*, p. 285.

colored light flashed almost entirely around the moon. These were continually changing in dimensions and color. This band was about 10" or 12" in width. It was generally separated from the dark margin of the lunar disk by a delicate line of white light, which disappeared as the changes of form or color took place. It lasted about twenty-seven seconds, after which, for the first time, he saw protuberances. These last did not differ from similar phenomena seen during former eclipses, sufficiently to call for a particular description. Of one of them, he says that he was "positive that it was uncovered by, and did not cover the moon." After giving special attention to one protuberance, he further adds — and this is of great importance, coming from so accurate and reliable an observer as Lieut. Gilliss—that "this examination confirms an opinion formed in 1858, and I am most thoroughly convinced that the masses which became visible, apparently around the lunar disk, were really clouds belonging to the solar atmosphere."^{*}

His attention was so thoroughly fixed on the principal solar cloud, that he lost the beat of the chronometer, and it became necessary to look at the dial of the instrument. In so doing, he took a hurried look at things between the northeast and south-southeast. "But it was as dark as night," and he could only see a shadowy outline of the near forest. He was away from the telescope not more than eight or ten seconds; but when he again looked at the sun, he found that a totally different picture had been substituted for the black disk before seen enriched with "a tremulous band of vermilion, or red, or yellow lights, overlapped by the solar clouds." The disk, as now seen, was thrown in bold relief upon a ground of pure white, traceable in all directions for the distance of a semi-diameter. The solar clouds were still visible, but the gorgeous circlet, before mentioned, was gone, and over the black surface of the moon, colors of the spectrum apparently flashed in circular bands of equal diameter with the lunar disk. Each band seemed to be about two minutes of arc broad. Its colors were crimson, or red, violet, yellow,

* *Ibid.* p. 286.

and green. These phenomena were not visible beyond the lunar disk. He compared the appearance to the changes in a kaleidoscope. Similar, or the same, phenomena were seen by Mr. Goldsborough, from Fort Strilacoom, and hence Lieut. Gilliss thinks that it is doubtful about their being attributable to an abnormal condition of the retina. *

Dr. J. Lamont has collected one hundred and thirteen memoirs relating to the eclipse of 1860, ninety-one of them pertaining to the observations and their results. From this memoir of Dr. Lamont, we learn that the investigators may be divided into two general classes, with respect to their opinions and conclusions in relation to the cause of the protuberances. † The first class, including Messrs. Airy, Levernir, Secchi, Aguilar, Struve, Mädler, Gautier, Bremicker, Gilliss, Winneke, Petit, Prazmowski, and Lespialt, are in favor of the hypothesis of solar clouds; while the second class, including Messrs. Plantamour, d'Abbadì, Marquez, Legrand, Faye, and Lamont, favor the hypothesis of the interference of light. Observations made on more recent eclipses with the spectroscope, as we shall see, have decided in favor of the first hypothesis. The principal European observers stationed in Spain, at three principal places as centres — Vitoria, Tarazona, Castillon de la Plana. The French government sent to Algiers, under M. Lamsedat, a commission consisting of officers and professors of the Polytechnic School, who stationed themselves at Batna, and the Viceroy of Egypt sent the astronomer of Cairo, Mahmoud Bey, with numerous assistants, to *Dongolah* on the Nile.

All these observers generally found that, when viewed through the screen, the sun seemed to have entirely disappeared; but on quickly removing it, a bright solar crescent was still to be seen, and it did not disappear until the lapse of twenty or thirty seconds. Professor Airy first saw this same phenomenon during the total eclipse of July 8th, 1842, at the Superga, near Turin, and he described it by saying that he had seen the sun vanish *twice* behind the moon. It

* *Coast Survey Report*, 1860, pp. 286-7. Figures are here given, illustrative of the various phenomena seen.

† See *Fortschritte der Physik*, xvi. pp. 569-602, and *Smithsonian Report*, 1864, pp. 240-257.

will readily be seen that this phenomenon is of considerable importance, since it will have an influence of greater or less extent on the observed period of totality, accordingly as the beginning and end are observed with the screen, or not.

During the second vanishing⁷ of the sun, or perhaps a few seconds earlier, numerous intensely red rays issued from the moon's limb, the smaller soon disappearing, but the larger ones remaining as *protuberances* after the completion of the eclipse. These protuberances, or red clouds, came out simultaneously on the east, south and north sides, but the period of totality was nearly half past before they were seen on the west. We have already seen that in this country the darkness was equal to that of night; but in Spain and Algiers it was sufficiently light to enable the observers to recognize the seconds of the chronometer and to read coarse print. One fact of importance we shall record here, namely, that the protuberances were better seen with a light red glass screen than without any screen at all, and with such a glass they could be followed longer, even after totality, circumstances attending the duration of an eclipse worthy of remembrance.

Several observers gave their attentions to photographing the eclipse, both when partial and when total; and a comparison of the results thus obtained, with those derived from direct observation and measurement, has shown that the former method is by far the most delicate; for the photographs show a considerable number of protuberances not otherwise recognized, and among them even very prominent ones, "of which no trace was to be perceived by direct observation." * "The explanation of this fact," says Dr. Lamont, "presents many difficulties, since, if we say that the light of those protuberances may act chemically without affecting the retina of the eye, we must not forget that in practice hitherto no example of this sort has yet been exhibited." † According to M. Goulier the photographs obtained by M. Lamey, in Metz, show the solar crescent surrounded on all sides by a bright light of which the direct observations show no trace.‡

* *Smith Rep.*, 1864, p. 248.† *Smith Rep.*, 1864, p. 248.‡ *Comptes Rendus*, li., p. 142.

NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

BELLES-LETTRES.

The Odes and Epodes of Horace. A metrical translation into English, with Introduction and commentaries. By LORD LYTTON, with Latin Text from the editions of Orelli Maclean and Yonge. 12mo. pp. 521. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The admirers of the Venusian bard may well thank Bulwer for this volume; it is not too much to say, that had the author of "Pelham" contributed in no other manner to the refinement of the public taste than by this translation, he would have merited the gratitude of every true lover of lyric poetry and classic culture. Other English versions of Horace, both in a metrical and prose form, have, indeed, been attempted at different times. So universal a favorite has Horace been in England, as well as in every other enlightened country, that there has not been a single English poet acquainted with the Latin, from Ben Johnson to Byron, both inclusive, who has not translated more or less of his Odes and Epodes. This is true, for example, of Cowley, Pope, Swift, Milton, Dryden, Addison, Moore, Chatterton, &c. Independently of these versions of particular lyrics, some of which are, indeed, excellent, several have undertaken to render the whole works of Horace; but the translation of Francis, first published in 1831, is the only one which is any longer referred to; the version of Lord Ravensworth, published in 1858, being confined to the Odes.

The reason of this is sufficiently obvious to scholars. There are very few who combine all the qualifications necessary to translate Horace. We have often wished, these twenty years past, that Bulwer, (now Lord Lytton), would undertake the task, feeling certain that no living author possesses so many of those qualifications. This was the general feeling among the literary men of England when his Lordship was finally induced to commence the present translation. Nor can any candid critic, capable of appreciating how difficult it is to transfuse into English the characteristic beauties of Horace, deny that the result is a happy one.

It would be foreign to our object, in this notice, to enter into details as to those peculiarities of Horace, which have caused so many to fail in attempting to reproduce the charms of his poetry in the English language. At all events, we think it will be much more agreeable and satisfactory to give a few specimens of the work, side by side with the original, so that the reader may judge for himself. With this view, we will transcribe a stanza here and there, rather than a whole ode, or epode, as the former course will give a more correct idea of the translation as a whole. In selecting stanzas for this purpose we shall be guided more by the application of the sentiments which they express to our own times, than by the beauties, either of the original, or of the translation. Accordingly, our first

extract will be from *Ad Azaros* (To the Misers), very properly entitled by Lord Lytton, "On the Money-making tendencies of the age"—the terms equivalent to *misers* and *millionaires* being synonymous among the ancients. A part of Horace's description of a sort of person, nowhere better known than among ourselves, at the present day, is rendered as follows by Lord Lytton:

"While his mean father with a perjured oath
Swindles alike his partner and his hearth guest,
Spurred by one passion—how to scrape the pelf—
His worthless self bequeaths an heir as worthless.

The immoderate riches grow, forsooth, and grow,
But ne'er in growing can attain completion;
An unknown something, ever absent still;
Stints into want the unsufficing fortune.*

This seems rather severe on the class alluded to; but it is certainly not more so than the original; nor is it more so than the facts justify. The second line of the first stanza seems quite familiar, but let the reader compare it with the closing line of the first of the two stanzas of the original, at the bottom of the page. It would appear that "Woman's Rights," and "Free Love" were not entirely unknown in Horace's time, for he contrasts the Roman dames with the Scythian women, intimating that the latter did not undertake to rule their lords:

No-dowered *she-despot* rules her lord, nor trusts
The wife's protection to the leman's splendor.
There, is the dower indeed magnificent!
Ancestral virtue, chastity unbroken.

Shrinking with terror from all love save one;
Or death the only sentence for dishonor
Oh, whoso'er would banish out of Rome
Intestine rage and fratricidal slaughter, †

The term "*she-despot*" seems harsh, but it only shows the poverty of our language, as to gender, for no other expression would have so well rendered "*nec dotata*" in connection with *conjuges regit virum*, and as for *rules* (*regit*), it is the very term the poet uses. But in order to judge

* Sen. Gracch. jubens trocho
Sed malis votiva legibus alic;
Cum perjura patris fides
Consortium socium fallat et hospitem,
Indigneque pecuniam
Heredi proferet, Scilicet imbrobus
Crescent divite; tamen
Curte nescio quid semper abest rei.—Book III., O. xxi.

† Illic matre carentibus
Privignis mulier temperat innocens;
Nec dotata regit virum
Conjuges, nec nitido fudit adultero.

Dos est magna parentum
Virtus, et metuens alterius viri
Certo fodere castitas;
Et peccare nefas, aut pretium est mori.

fully of the justice done to the misers, and those whom their money corrupts, by both Horace and the author of the "Lady of Lyons," the whole ode must be read.

It is pleasant to turn from the millionaires and viragos to the beautiful ode addressed to Virgil, on the death of Quintilian, the prince of Roman critics, and the great champion of superior education. Few had more enemies than Quintilian, during his life time, because he never shrank from condemning whatever had a tendency to vitiate the public taste, even though it was the production of the most powerful and wealthy. But in this ode, and in his *Ars Poetica*, Horace has immortalised him:—

So, the eternal slumber clasps Quintilianus,
Whose equal when shall shame-faced sense of Honor,
Incorrupt Faith, of Justice the twin sister,
Or Truth unveiled, find?

By many a good man wept, he died;—no mourner
Wept with tears sadder than thine own, O Virgil!
Pious, alas, in vain! thou redemandest
Quintilian from the gods.*

Even Longinus has not attained greater glory than this. No one has rendered the two stanzas better than Lord Lytton; perhaps no one has made so near an approach to a faithful rendering. He has not entirely succeeded, because it is utterly impossible to reproduce, in a similar form, the beauty, grace, and anguish, especially of the first of the two stanzas, quoted below. The *pudor* (modesty), *incorrupta fides* (uncorrupted faith), *soror Justitie* (the sister of Justice), and *nuda Veritas* (naked truth), of Horace, cannot be rendered into English metre, so as to do justice to the poet; yet we are much pleased with what the present translator has done. But in the second stanza he has succeeded admirably; even

Nulli flebilior quam tibi, Virgili,

full of tenderness, grace and pathos as it is, is scarcely more affecting, when we bear in mind who the mourned and mourners are, than Bulwer's

"No mourner
Wept with tears sadder than thine own, O Virgil!"

It would not be right to take even so hurried and brief a glance as this at the Odes and Epodes of Horace without at least a passing word in regard to his amatory effusions, for, like all lyric poets, if, indeed, not like all poets and all great thinkers, he is never more truly poetical, or more fascinating, than when inspired by virtuous and modest, but partial

* Ergo Quintilianum perpetuus sopor
Urget! cui Pudor, et Justitie soror,
Incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas
Quando ulum inveniet parem?

Multis ille bonis flebilis cecidit;
Nulli flebilior quam tibi, Virgili.
Tu frustra pius, heu! non ita creditum
Poscis Quintilianum deos.—B. I., O. XXI.

beauty. Like all who really love the sex, Horace could ill endure the idea of having a rival in the affections of his beloved one. Most charmingly does this fond jealousy receive expression in one of his Odes to Lydia.* Passing over the first stanza of the translation, for lack of space, we transcribe the second:

*' Then in my mind thought has no settled base,
 As not few shifts upon my cheek the odor,
 And tears that glide down in stealth reveal
 By what slow fire mine inward self consumeth.' †*

All who compare this with the original will admit that it is capital. The last line especially is singularly happy. But this reminds us of the last stanza, which, although not perhaps so poetical as the rest of the ode, is worth quoting, as showing that however many the poet loved, still, when the moment of reflection came, he was in favor of mutual fidelity and constancy.

*Thrice happy, ay more than twice happy, they
 Whom one soft bond unbroken binds together,
 Whose love grows from back ring and espousal
 In life's last moment binds the first that severs. ‡*

Some have inferred from the expression "*malis querimoniis*," that for a portion of his time, at least, the poet was subject to "certain lectures;" but whether his translator has had similar experience or not, it is certain that he has succeeded well in giving the sense of the original in an agreeable form.

No one familiar with Horace need be informed that many instances might be pointed out in which justice has not been done him by the translator; but we have no wish to blame any one for what is inevitable. When a useful work of any kind is performed so well upon the whole, as the most sanguine, if acquainted with the difficulties which surround it, could expect, it is ungenerous to criticise it. This version of Horace is eminently useful; we may add that it is eminently good, and if such ought to be criticised we prefer to thank the author for the inestimable service he has rendered.

The general reader, as well as students of the classics, will find the commentaries and notes both interesting and useful; another commendable feature of the work is that the original, as well as the translation, is remarkably free from typographical errors.

* B. i., O. xlii.

† *Tua nec moras mihi nec color
 Certa solent, odor, humor et in genas
 Furtim labitur, argens
 Quam lentis pectus maceret ignibus.*

‡ *Felices ter et amplius,
 Quos irrupta tenet copula, nec malis
 Divulsas querimoniis
 Suprema citius solvet amor dies.*

Message of the President of the United States to the Senate and House of Representatives. Washington, December, 1869.

We have taken up the President's Message with every disposition to be pleased with it. There is no reason why we should proceed to its perusal with any different feeling. Our readers will remember that we were in favor of the election of General Grant, not, however, because we thought him competent to be the chief magistrate of so great and enlightened a nation as this, for we never for a moment entertained any such opinion.

We preferred the General only because we regarded his opponent as a mere politician; one whose only claim was a certain equivocal valubility of tongue. Not but we estimated as highly as most of his friends the general's military talents; nay, more, we thought and urged that he deserved the gratitude of the nation—of Southerners as well as Northerners—for having saved the republic from permanent disruption. In short, our impression was, that Mr. Chase should be placed at the head of the republic, and General Grant at the head of our whole *military* system.

Nor has anything occurred since the general's election that could excite in us any spite. We have never applied to his excellency for any office for ourselves, or anybody else. If ever so well disposed to present him a house, a horse, or even a donkey, we had none to spare. We cannot even reproach him for want of courtesy, for we have never troubled him with the briefest call, though several times in Washington since his inauguration; but it might, perhaps, have been otherwise in regard to this, had we not understood that he is always surrounded by a phalanx of generals, colonels, majors, captains, &c., &c., together with a still greater host of brokers, railroad speculators, millionaires, present makers, and politicians of all grades—in a word, by all sort of people—*except* literary or scientific men.

We therefore proceed to read his excellency's Message in perfect good humor; nor do we conclude its perusal in any different mood; on the contrary, we have seldom been more amused even by a comedy. With the stereotyped forms we have nothing to do; nor have we any fault to find with the substantial facts or the figures. Indeed, all the president *intended* to say is entirely satisfactory to us, and perfectly harmless; it is what he *has said* that amused us. We would, however, gladly conceal this feeling had we no other motive than to amuse ourselves or our readers; but we want to show, in as reverential a manner as we can, that it should be expected, in a great and enlightened nation like ours, that its chief magistrate should be able to express himself in the vernacular tongue, in a style which could not be called childish or "hifalutin." Nor need we go beyond the first paragraph. A sentence or two will tell whether we are over-exacting or hypercritical. First we invite attention to the following, only premising that we have examined several copies of the

message, in as many different journals, hoping, but in vain, to discover that burlesque passages were interpolated by some malicious, disappointed scribe :

"We are blessed with peace at home, and are without entangling alliances abroad to forebode trouble; with a territory unsurpassed in fertility, of an area equal to the abundant support of five hundred millions of people, and abounding in every variety of useful minerals, in quantity sufficient to supply the world for generations; with exuberant crops; with a variety of climate adapted to the production of every species of earth's riches, and suited to the habits, tastes and requirements of every living thing; with a population of forty million of free people, all speaking one language; with facilities for every mortal to acquire an education; with institutions closing to none the avenues of fame or any blessing of fortune that may be coveted; with freedom of the pulpit, the press and the school; with a revenue flowing into the national Treasury beyond the requirements of the government."

This, it will be admitted, is on a pretty high key. But let us determine, if we can, what the whole sentence, with all its ramifications, means—a task which, to our humble comprehension, is by no means easy. First, we are informed as to "*an area equal to the abundant support,*" &c., as if mere extent were the test of productiveness. This however, is but a trifle, and we may pass over our wonderful "minerals," which are "to supply the whole world for generations," with a similar remark. But our "area" and our "minerals," full of honest pride as we ought to be when we think of them, dwindle into significance when we compare them with our "climate," which, we are informed, is "*adapted to the production of every species of earth's riches, and suited to the habits, tastes and requirements of every living thing.*"

We beg leave to think that the President ought to have taken breath here, and commenced a new sentence. Who had ever discovered before that "climate" is so amazingly productive? A climate that is at once suited to the *tastes* of a frog and an alderman, a millionaire and a lizard, a politician and a donkey, a great statesman and a little mouse, is indeed something we may well boast of! Yet it seems that there are some "living things" to whose *habits and tastes* it is not so well suited after all. We have yet no elephants, royal tigers, or even zebras in a state of nature.

Perhaps the "blessing" which ranks next to our climate is, the "*facilities for every mortal to acquire an education.*" Now, seeing that every living being which is not immortal is "mortal," it follows that even the frog, the lizard, the donkey, and the mouse, as well as the alderman, the statesman, and the politician, may avail themselves of our educational "facilities;" but the misfortune is, that both classes of "mortals" are rather disposed to play truant, and indulge in conduct and habits very different from those of students.

Our "institutions," also, are found to possess some new attributes, though they are rather of a negative character, "*closing to none the avenues of fame, or any blessing of fortune that may be coveted.*" This is exceedingly encouraging! Institutions which do not close "*any blessing of fortune,*" &c., must be held to be very indulgent. But what of the Tenure of

Office Act? Has that a tendency to close "any blessing of fortune that may be coveted?" So much for *one sentence* of the President's Message; now we transcribe one sentence more from the same first paragraph:

"Manufactures hitherto unknown in our country are springing up in all directions, producing a degree of national independence unequalled by that of any other Power."

Who can tell us what these new and wonderful manufactures are? Do they include our "shoddy" manufactures? our paper collar manufactures? our velocipede manufactures? our faro bank manufactures? or our counterfeit currency manufactures? They must be something great, undoubtedly, since they are "producing a degree of national independence unequalled by that of any other Power." (!) What will the other great powers of the world say when they learn that they cannot equal our "degree of national independence?"

Report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Washington, December, 1868.

Mr. Boutwell has managed to introduce a great many things into his report, but neither statesmanship nor political economy. It is true that there is a good deal which is intended for the latter, but it is the sort of political economy which we heard some time since from the young ladies of Vassar College. We readily admit, that, having been in the habit, for several years, of reviewing the masterly reports of Chase and McCullough, we may have expected too much from Boutwell. Be this as it may, the falling off is really immense.

If Massachusetts does not feel humiliated, on reading the document before us, it is because she has never recognised Mr. Boutwell as anything more than one of her fourth rate politicians. O, shades of Webster, Everett, and Choate! But, certainly, Massachusetts has sufficient intellectual culture and statesmanship to-day to represent her respectably in the national cabinet. Nor need she go beyond the radical party to choose one possessed of those qualifications; we do not, however, mean the silver spoon gentleman, although he, too, has a hundred-fold more ability than Mr. Boutwell. We do not, indeed, admire all that is said and done by Mr. Sumner. But he would do vastly more honor, both to Massachusetts and the nation, at the head of the treasury department, than the author of the report before us. That it is not on political grounds we criticise our present secretary of the treasury, is sufficiently obvious from the fact that we should be entirely satisfied with Mr. Sumner in that position, because, however much he may err in some respects, he has undeniable claims to the character of a statesman and political economist. He would represent the refinement, as well as the talent of Massachusetts; whereas the characteristics of that enlightened state represented at present, are its petty thrift, its fussy smartness, its little cunning, its narrow prejudices—in a word, its "Yankee notions." We do not say that all this is apparent in Mr. Boutwell's report, but it is as much like the author as any composition of the kind could be said to resemble its manufacturer.

We are not surprised that there is no topic contained in his report, on which Mr. Boutwell is so eloquent as he is in his special pleading for the increase of salaries in the treasury departments; nor can we pretend to be much astonished, when he suggests in plain terms that honesty is as much a marketable commodity among the treasury officials, as it is among the brokers of Wall street! Thus, in winding up one of his arguments, he informs Congress and the public, that, "*under such circumstances, the government is not without responsibility when it places its officers in such a position that they are compelled to choose between dishonesty on one hand, and penury on the other.*" That is, let the treasury officials be paid suitably for being honest, and they will not steal, thieve, or defraud! A sentence or two farther down in the same paragraph, we have the following: "The salaries of the *Assistant Treasurer and the principal officers*, should also be increased, *and for substantially the same reason.*"

All will be honest and honorable men, if they only get their price. Our fraudulent collectors would also be honest, if they were only paid enough for not being rogues! But this is but a specimen of Mr. Boutwell's political economy. We hope some enterprising publisher will induce him to write a treatise on the subject for the use of schools and academies; but have it in the bargain that he will employ some discreet friend to correct the English of it; so as not to allow expressions like "speaking generally" to be repeated more than twice in the one paragraph, or words like "such" to be repeated more than twice in the one sentence.

In reviewing one of the reports of Mr. McCulloch, and commending the integrity and statesman-like ability, of which it afforded such agreeable and convincing evidence, we remarked that the only one of our state, or city officials, we could compare to its author, was Comptroller Brennan. But which of our officials shall we compare with Mr. Boutwell? Not certainly Comptroller Connolly, for he has never proclaimed that the honesty of his subordinates is a marketable commodity—something that may be neutralized, mesmerized, or extinguished altogether, according to the amount of money brought to bear upon it! Upon the other hand, the present comptroller of New York city makes no pretensions to literary ability; and yet, if any of his reports be compared to that of the secretary of the treasury of the United States, now before us, it will be found not to contain one-fourth as much bad grammar, or one-tenth as much spurious political economy as the latter.

We can find a New York functionary, however, even without going to the custom house, who will compare quite well with the Hon. George S. Boutwell. What say our city readers, who know both parties, to the Hon. Thomas Stephens, president of the Croton Board, as a set-off to that gentleman? We beg pardon of our esteemed Massachusetts and Athenian friends for the comparison, for we admit that it is very uncom-

plimentary to them. A comparison between our croton guardian and a *thirsty*, but *thrifty*, Boston alderman, would seem much more compatible with general facts; yet Boutwell and Stephens have more qualities in common, and lack more qualities in common, than any two functionaries we know. True, one is a radical, and the other a democrat; it is also true that croton water and gold, or even paper money, are different things; but if some of the brokers of Wall street are interrogated confidentially, they will admit that the democrat and his croton can, sometimes—when bids are free and *pipes* cheap—be turned to as profitable account as the radical and his gold!

The Magnetiser. The Prodigal. Comedies in Prose. By LAUGHTON OSBORN. New York: James Miller. 1869.

While engaged in the effort of perusing this volume, we were repeatedly reminded of the story of the Italian culprit who chose to serve a term in the galleys rather than read through Guicciardini's history. It certainly ought to be classed among those books which are said to be more easily written than read. It is evident from the notes appended to each of the comedies that the author intended the latter both for representation on the stage and "for the closet, that is, for the reading of literary men." But any audience that could keep its attention fixed on either of these comedies, "drawing its slow length along," would display most miraculous patience; and no literary man, except a reviewer would be likely to peruse the book faithfully to the end. The language is heavy and slipshod, the characters destitute of individuality, the plots crude and improbable, and the wit (?) dry and clumsy.

In neither of the dramas can a single scene be pointed out containing a trace of the truly comic; what is meant for humor is always too dull and awkward. Two years ago, in reviewing a volume of Mr. Osborn's tragedies,* we expressed in the most friendly spirit the opinion that his forte was neither tragedy nor poetry in any form; but that he might possibly succeed in other branches of literature. Mr. Osborn thereupon honored us, so we understand, with an effusion after the style of "English bards and Scotch reviewers." We have never had the curiosity to read this, though we have no objection to its most careful perusal by those who have a taste for that sort of thing. Nor do we allow the circumstance to have the slightest weight with us in forming our opinion of the volume now before us. However much of the comic there may be in his tragedies, that merit entirely fails to show itself just where it is wanted, unless, for example, the author regard it as comic for a young lady, supposed to be carefully

* No. XXXV, March, 1867.

brought up and well-educated, to make use of such words as *deuse* and *devil*, or for an old gentleman occupying a respectable position in society, to take particular delight in indecent innuendoes in the presence of the ladies. One personage in the "Magnetiser" intended to be both witty and refined, has no other means of showing those qualities than by indulging in common-place Italian phrases, snatches from operas, &c.

In one of the pieces a shallow attempt is made to conceal its barrenness by giving the personages names suggestive of their individuality. A dishonest German bookkeeper is called Mr. Heilliger Shurk. Another clerk is poetically dubbed Henry Ledger. A faithful servant of Teutonic extraction receives the name of Hans Guterknecht, and an "enterprising" publisher that of Revise Proofsheets.

But the most puerile feature in either of the pieces is an attempted burlesque on Mr. Charles Dickens, who appears in the Prodigal under the name of "Buzz Pickins, an English author of note on a tour in America." The speeches attributed to him are sometimes outlandish in the extreme. For instance, the following:

"Soho, trallala, &c. Devil, if I can get that fellow's song out of my head! wish I was on the lark with Stockton about it. But here comes some other Yankee. Ledger—a little stupid—but better than none. How are you, *old boss*? as you say here in America. Let's have a spree. Oysters and fire-punch—or champagne and billiards—whatever you like. * * * A row, then, with the Charlies, or a lark with the girls, or a roll into one of your coalholes among the niggers. I like your niggers; they're the only wits, poets and mimics you have in America. Come, (*dancing and staying negro fashion*.)

'We'll dance all night till de broad daylight,

And go hum wid de gals in de mornin.'

I'm your man for anything, Ledge; I've got the devil in me; it can't be that poor half bottle of claret I've just swigged at Stockton's; but damme, I'm up for something!" (p. 197.)

We wish the reader to consider nothing said in this notice as having reference to the general character of Mr. Miller's publications, for he has published books which we have taken pleasure in recommending for their merits. But the volume just reviewed would be a curiosity on the book shelves of any publisher.

SCIENCE AND EDUCATION.

Histoire Naturelle du Jura, et des départements voisins, Ouvrage couronné par trois médailles d'or et deux médailles de vermeil. Tome 1er, *Géologie*, 1er Fascicule. *Géographie physique, Hydrographie, Météorologie, Agriculture, Minérale, Minéralogie, Pétrologie, et Paléontologie*. Par Le FRÈRE OGERIEN, Directeur de l'école chrétienne de Lons-Le-Saunier, Membre titulaire de l'Institut des provinces de France, de la Société géologique de France, de plusieurs Académies et Sociétés savantes. Paris: Victor Masson et Fils. Octavo, pp. 570.

Among the many books which we have to examine, from time to time,

it is but seldom we meet with a work at once so interesting and instructive, as the series of four volumes, of which that whose title we give above, is the first. Two volumes are devoted to geology; one to zoology; and one to botany. In the complete work, now before us, the natural history of the Jura, and neighboring departments, is not only fully exhibited, in its various branches, but each of the sciences which it embraces, is invested with an attractiveness which is well calculated to encourage the youthful mind to the study of nature. Indeed, this happy faculty, on the part of the author, of clothing even abstract facts in a garb which gives them an air of novelty, is one of the principal reasons why we take up the work at this time; for we should be glad that some of our own scientific authors would profit by its graphic, lucid, yet perfectly easy style, as well as by its admirable arrangement of topics.

We always expect much in natural history from the country that has produced Buffon, Cuvier, Gay-Lussac, De Saussure, &c. Precisely because such men have shed lustre on the investigation of nature, in France, an inferior work, on any branch of natural history, has no chance in that country of receiving the *flat* of its scientific societies, if it does not possess genuine merit. There it does not do for those ambitious to be authors, merely to take up the works of others, and transpose them with more or less skill. Such writers there are in France, as well as elsewhere, but they are not recognised as authors, or even as thinkers. In order to obtain admission to the guild of scientific authors, in France, the candidate must exhibit original research; it is not sufficient that he is an investigator; he must show that his investigations have produced some fruits—that, in fact, they have added, more or less, to the general stock of knowledge. Those unacquainted with the canons of merit in France, may be able to form an idea from this of the significance of the medals conferred on the author, for each of these volumes.

But without any knowledge of his medals, or of any other honors of which he has been the recipient, we should have inferred, before opening his book, from his having devoted twenty years of his life to the study of geology, chemistry, and zoology, that he must have been capable of writing instructively on those sciences. But we have still stronger presumptive evidence of the qualifications of Frère Ogérien; for we learn that he occupied, for twelve years, the chair of geology and mineralogy in a well-known college at Lyons. But any intelligent, competent person who examines the volumes before us, needs no further evidence of the *status* of the author, either as a scientific man or as an educator; after this examination has been duly made, there is no need to be informed that M. Ogérien numbers among his personal friends, the most eminent scientific men in Europe.

The title page of the first volume, which we have placed at the head of this notice, shows the wide range which it takes in its discussions. In the second volume, is treated geology properly, so called,* as ap-

* Géologie proprement dite, appliquée aux Arts, à l'Industrie et surtout à l'Agriculture.

plied to the arts, to industry, and, above all, to agriculture. These two volumes are called, by the author, first *fascicule* and second *fascicule*, and not volumes or tomes, although each is an octavo separately and substantially bound, both containing nearly 1,000 pages. We mention this fact as illustrative of the author's modesty, the term "fascicule" merely signifying a small bundle of grass, or a bunch of flowers. The first volume contains a meteorological map of the Jura, divided into five zones; the second contains a geological map of the same department, each drawn and colored by the author.

The third volume (tome ii.) devoted to Botany,* is chiefly the work of M. E. Michalet, who was the assistant of Frère Ogérien, but died before the work was finished. Our author pays a fine tribute to his memory; it is evident that he gives him at least all the credit to which he is entitled.

The fourth volume (tome iii.), which extends to nearly a thousand pages, is devoted to Zoology.† This by itself would have entitled Frère Ogérien to take high rank as a naturalist. It embraces brief but remarkably graphic and faithful descriptions of all living animals to be found in the Jura, including birds, reptiles, worms, mollusks, &c. The volume is copiously illustrated, and besides an extensive "Table des Matiers," it has the advantage of a full alphabetical index, which embraces both the scientific and common names of all animals treated in the work.

We confess that intrinsically valuable as the *Histoire Naturelle du Jura*, &c., is, we should not have taken so much pains with it as we have, not considering it likely that it will be translated in this country, had we not been informed that, in future, American education is to have the benefit of his extensive learning and versatile talents. As the title page we have copied above implies, Frère Ogérien is a member of the educational Roman catholic order of the Christian Brothers—a fraternity well and favorably known in this country, by protestants as well as catholics, for their zealous and unwearied efforts for the advancement of education of every grade, from the highest to the lowest.

Our readers may remember that we have taken the liberty of comparing those of the Christian Brothers, in charge of colleges in this country, to the Jesuits in charge of similar institutions. There was no reason why we should have any prejudice against the latter, which would induce us to depreciate their labors as educators, as compared with those of the former; if we had any bias in regard to the Jesuits, it was one in their favor, for it had been our privilege to have met many learned and able men, both in Europe and America, belonging to the society, and by no men had we been more kindly, or more liberally treated. The Christian Brothers,

*Botanique, par M. B. Michalet, Magistrat, membre de la société botanique de France et de plusieurs autres sociétés savantes, revue et achevée par M. Grenier, professeur à la faculté des sciences de Besançon.

† Zoologie vivante, par Le Frère Ogérien, directeur de l'école chrétienne de Lons-Le-Sauvuer, membre de plusieurs Académies et Sociétés savantes.

upon the other hand, we knew but little about, until an educational friend induced us to visit Manhattan College. Having previously had opportunities of forming an opinion of the Jesuit colleges of New York, we felt convinced from what we saw at the Christian Brothers' college, of the superiority of the latter; and we did not hesitate to say so in our journal.

We have never made any criticism on the Fathers, either as clergymen or moralists; but it seems they would have forgiven us much more readily for having found fault both with their religion and morals, than for having proclaimed that the Christian Brothers give a more thorough education at their college than the Jesuits of either Fordham or New York. The latter felt instinctively that this was true; and there are occasions when nothing is more provoking, even to pious men, than the truth. We fear we shall have less chance to be forgiven now than ever, when we remark, by way of explanation for the difference just pointed out, that while the superiors of the Christian Brothers send their most learned and eminent men to their college in New York*—the superiors of the Jesuits seem to think that their most incompetent men are good enough for New York and Fordham.

Be this as it may, we congratulate Manhattan on the accession of Frère Ogérien to its staff of scientific professors. It is worthy of remark, that those who had charge of the latter institution, as president and vice-president, seven years ago, when we were requested to examine its classes, have still charge of it as provincial and president, respectively; both having been worthily promoted for their abilities, zeal and success;† whereas during the same period, we do not know how many presidents, vice-presidents, provincials, &c., have had charge of St. Xavier's and St. John's colleges. It is very well to remove incompetent men, and we readily admit that not one has been sent away from New York or Fordham, who was not utterly unqualified for his position; but the misfortune is that, as far as we have seen or heard, thus far, the successor is still more incompetent than the predecessor, although, as already remarked, there are still great educators in America as well as in Europe, among the Jesuits.

Comparisons, we are quite aware, are "odious;" at the same time, we hold that they are not only perfectly legitimate in criticism, but highly useful, and especially in cases of this kind. Hence we say that the Christian Brothers are modest and unassuming men, who devote themselves to teaching, and to no other worldly affairs; and who, far from being bigoted or prejudiced, are justly distinguished for their gen-

* The Christian Brothers have several other colleges in this country; they have one at St. Louis so ably and judiciously managed that it is scarcely inferior to Manhattan.

† Another evidence of the enlightened views of these gentlemen may be found in a very creditable and useful magazine, entitled *De La Salle Monthly*, started at their suggestion, by the students of Manhattan, and regularly published in this city, with, we believe, a good prospect of permanency and success.

nine christian liberality. It is true, that the most learned of the Jesuits are modest and unassuming, and, contrary to the general opinion among protestants, liberal, also. All honor to this class; far be it from us to depreciate their educational labors in the slightest degree; those whom we criticize, and to whom we would present the good example of the Christian Brothers, are neither modest, unassuming, nor liberal as educators, precisely because they are not qualified for their positions — because they have not undergone that intellectual discipline which, while it teaches the difference between ignorance and knowledge, at the same time, imparts a wholesome vigor to the mind.

Paris Universal Exposition, 1867. Reports of the United States Commissioners. Machinery and Processes of the Industrial Arts and Apparatus of the Exact Sciences. By FREDERICK A. P. BARNARD, LL.D., United States Commissioner. 8vo, 669. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1869.

We confess that we very seldom even glance at books bearing the government imprint, the reason being that we expect little from such. In general they seem as if it had been their chief object to serve the printer and the paper manufacturer. But the volume now before us forms a remarkable exception. Happening to look at different other parts, before the title page, we did not hesitate to come to the conclusion that it came from the press of the Harpers, as that house had recently, *de more*, issued some excellent works, including a fine new edition of Humboldt's "Cosmos." And far from dispelling the illusion, the name of Dr. Barnard, of Columbia College, rather strengthened it, for reasons which will be sufficiently obvious to those aware of the scholarly attainments and literary abilities of that gentleman.

All this may imply a confusion of ideas on our part, but, be it so; at all events, an examination of the book has satisfied us that as Boetia has produced a Pindar, so may the government printing office be occasionally expected to produce a learned, valuable, and interesting work, for such is really the character of that now before us. The briefest way in which we can give our readers an idea of the reason why it is so, is by transcribing the first paragraph of the preface:

"The following report is an attempt to comply with that portion of the instructions issued by the Secretary of State to the Commission of the United States, to the Exposition of 1867, which required a report to be prepared upon the new inventions in the useful arts, illustrated in the Exposition. It need hardly be remarked that an entirely satisfactory execution of a task like that here presented, could be reasonably expected only from the co-operation of a number of individuals, severally qualified, by previous familiarity with the different departments of industry represented, to appreciate the merits of the various objects subjected to their examination. The preparation of the required report was therefore, originally, very properly, confided to a committee; but the plan of a joint report, at first contemplated, was found in the end to be impracticable, and was accordingly aban-

done. Some members of the committee preferred to direct their attention to the study of special subjects, and the general duties imposed on the committee devolved at length upon the present reporter alone. This statement is felt to be necessary in explanation, or rather, perhaps, in justification of an attempt on the part of the reporter to execute a task not willingly assumed by him, and which he found no encouragement to undertake in the consciousness of special qualification."

That the task is ably executed no unprejudiced person, competent to form an intelligent opinion, will deny. Our wonder is that any one of Dr. Barnard's time of life, could have performed such an amount of intellectual labor within so brief a period, and perform at the same time, except while absent from New York, various other duties no less exacting or onerous. It would be impossible to give even a vague idea, in this brief glance, of the multifarious subjects which are discussed by Dr. Barnard, as only a man familiar with the sciences, and wielding a graphic, lucid pen, could discuss them.

Fourteen elaborate chapters are devoted to the industrial arts, and four chapters to the exact sciences. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that most of these chapters contain more interesting and useful information than an equal number of the scientific lectures generally delivered before large and admiring audiences. The opening chapter, on "The relation of invention to industrial progress," is one of the most brilliant and able essays, of its kind, we have read in several years. Some idea may be formed of the numerous topics commented upon, to a greater or less extent, in this volume, from the fact that its alphabetic index extends to eighteen pages in small type.

Bibliothèque des Merveilles, publiée sous la direction de M. EDOUARD CHARTON. *Les Merveilles Célestes*, Lectures du Soir, par CAMILLE FLAMMARION, Auteur de *La Pluralité des Mondes habités*. Deuxième édition, illustrée de 46 vignettes astronomiques, et de deux planches. 8vo., pp. 394. Paris: Librairie de L. Hachette & Cie, 1867.

This volume is the seventh of a series of upwards of thirty, devoted to the popularization of several departments of science. The list of subjects is very varied, ranging from balloons to railways, from grottos to astronomy, from the intelligence of animals to lighthouses. Architecture, meteorology, optics, vegetation, parks and gardens, earthquakes, volcanoes, the coasts of France, ruins, tombs, glaciers, gold, silver, sound, glass-making, the plastic arts; all find a place in the catalogue, and these topics have been treated by writers who have made each particular subject their speciality. The names of these professors may be well known in France, but, with one or two exceptions, they have not universal reputation.

M. Flammarion is already known by his treatises on the Plurality of

inhabited World's, Imaginary and Real Worlds, and Studies on Astronomy. The theory of the plurality of worlds finds few opponents at the present day, though received with hostility when Fontenelle brought it forward, and Whiston indulged in speculations thereon, at the beginning of the last century. The late Professor Whewell, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, it is true, revived opposition to it, but failed to convince the world that he aimed at anything else than the glorification of his own university. We have not read *La Pluralité des Mondes habités*, but we have carefully examined the *Merveilles Célestes*, and infer from the style of the latter, that the author has thrown into the former all the fervor and enthusiasm which characterizes his last work. It is, in fact, this style that constitutes the charm of the *Merveilles Célestes*, for, if the truth must be told, the amount of solid information contained in it does not exceed that of any elementary work on the subject that has come before us—and we have seen many. As a rule, elementary works on astronomy are unsatisfactory; they are usually filled with statistics which it is difficult to remember or even to classify. When we are told that the sun is the centre of our system; that it revolves on its own axis; that the earth and the other planets do the same, and also revolve round the sun; that the satellites revolve round their principals; that this revolution on an axis is the cause of day and night, and partly of the tides, and that the latter are due to the attraction of the sun and moon; we have imbibed the substance of what is to be learned in astronomy, without a knowledge of mathematics.

It has always seemed to us like beginning at the wrong end to dilate upon spheres and ellipses, orbits, periodic times, parallax, radii, vectors, Kepler's laws, planetary disturbances, and celestial distances, before the mind of the student has been prepared by a *course* of mathematics to really comprehend the difficulties of this noblest of all sciences. If it were not for diagrams, most of the elementary works on astronomy would be almost unintelligible. For the most part, they are in the form of question and answer; and the staple of the questions is distances, sizes, and times:—e. g., “How far is the earth from the sun?” “In how many days does the earth revolve round the sun?” “Which are the inferior, and which the superior planets?” “How many times is Jupiter larger than Mercury?” and the like; which the beginner learns by rote, and forgets when he leaves school. M. Flammarion has avoided this tiresome and unprofitable mode of teaching astronomy, and has published his work in the form of lectures to beginners. His object is, as he expresses it, in his preface, rather to create or diffuse a taste for study, than to instruct. To use his own words:—

“Notre but ici est moins d'instruire que de repandre le goût de l'étude, et de montrer combien il doit être agréable d'être instruit. Nous le demandons en effet à nos jeunes lecteurs: qu'ils permettent à leurs intelligences de s'approcher seulement au bord du

panorama révélé par la science, ils ne tarderont pas à deviner que les plus pures jouissances de notre vie sont dans la contemplation de la nature, et bientôt leur ardeur frémissante se sentira capable de comprendre les grandes vérités de la création."

M. Flammarion is an enthusiast, and, if long paragraphs of rapturous wonder at the power and wisdom of the Almighty (somewhat closely imitating the style of Nichol's "Architecture of the Heavens") and frequent quotations from poets, will achieve the end in view, his work will assuredly prove successful. The first lecture is wholly an apostrophe to Night, flavored with quotations from Byron, Young, Lamartine, and Madame de Girardin! The second is similarly addressed to the heavens, and in it the author takes occasion to impress upon his readers the doctrine that the earth and the heavens are not two separate creations, but one; the earth is in the heavens.

"Le ciel et la Terre ne font pas deux créations séparées, comme en vous l'a répété mille et mille fois; ils ne sont qu'un. La Terre est dans le Ciel. Le Ciel c'est l'espace immense, l'étendue indéfinie, le vide sans bornes."

His efforts to give an idea of the immensity of universal space (Lecture 3) are more successful than any we have met with elsewhere. He does not attempt to define space and duration, as many philosophers have tried to do, but says, wisely: "Toute définition ne pourrait qu'obscurcir l'idée primitive qui est en nous." Starting from the earth as a point of departure, and travelling with the velocity of light in a straight line for a century, by which time the figures required to express the distance in leagues that we had travelled would have become so many as to cease to convey any idea to the mind—we should then discover the marvel of the problem—"nous n'avons pas avancé d'un *seul pas* dans l'espace." . . . "monter on ciel, descendre sous la terre, ces expressions sont fausses en elles mêmes, car étant situés au sein de l'infini, nous ne pouvons ni monter ni descendre il y a ni haut ni bas."

The work is divided into five parts, designated respectively, "L'Ensemble," "Notre Univers," "LeDomaine du Soleil," "La Terre," and "Aspect philosophique de la création." The first treats of the general appearance of the heavens, the milky way, the nebula, the distribution of the stars by "agglomerations," and the operation of a spiral movement among them, an idea suggested by an anonymous writer in 1702, and subsequently advocated by Swedenborg, to whom the world is indebted for many valuable discoveries in science, among them the atomic theory, usually attributed to Dalton. The second part treats of the sidereal world, the constellations, the zodiac, the number of the stars, the variable, temporary, binary, trinary, &c., stars, and is beautifully illustrated, as indeed, the whole work is, with engravings. The third part comprises the planetary system and comets. The fourth part discusses the movements and features of the earth and the moon and eclipses. The fifth and last comments on the doctrine of the plurality of worlds, and concludes with some reflections suggested by the contemplation of the

heavens. M. Flammarion is an elegant scholar as well as writer. He is familiar with the poetry of England and of America, and is profuse of quotations from it.

Popular Science ; addressed to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (For the Salem, Mass., Meeting, August, 1869). By Mrs. LINCOLN PHELPS, member of the Association. Baltimore : 1869.

In this slender pamphlet we have an eloquent defence of the Linnæan system in botany, together with an earnest and convincing appeal in favor of the study of that beautiful science. In order to satisfy our readers that the *brochure* deserves to be read, especially by educators, we extract a paragraph or two :

" Since the days of Linnaeus, there have been great advances in the science of Botany, but this very progress has, perhaps, been the cause of a retrograde movement in another direction. While there has been an enlargement of the knowledge of the laws which govern the vegetable kingdom among the few who devote themselves to the study of the science, there has been a loss of enthusiasm for botanical pursuits among students in our schools and colleges : *this is to be deprecated, since such pursuits, combined with severer study, conduce greatly to health, and elevated and refined the taste and imagination.*"

The part we have italicised is particularly true. We should be glad to transcribe the paragraphs immediately following ; but we can only make room for another brief passage, and this we take from the next page :

" It is a fact which can be substantiated upon inquiry, that in many female schools where botany was once a favorite study and amusement, and botanising a recreation, *the science is no longer cultivated.* Teachers, fearing to be behind the age, have attempted to begin with the so-called natural system, laying aside the simple method of Linnaeus. Instead of beginning with the flower, as taught by that method, they grope among the many facts which make up what is called the *natural classification*, until, like the college student we have mentioned, the pupils are glad to escape from the web of *tissues* and the dark purities of *cells.*"
—p. 5.

To the correctness of the first sentence, which is, perhaps, the most remarkable, we can, ourselves, bear testimony. We have often wondered why so little attention is paid to botany in our female schools, seminaries, colleges, &c. ; but what has surprised us most in relation to the subject is, that those schools, seminaries, and colleges, situated in the country, or in small cities and towns, pay, in general, far less attention to botany than our city institutions. Nay, in some instances, we have observed a striking contrast in this respect, for at some of the schools which we have had the pleasure of visiting in this city, from time to time, we have found some accomplished botanists among the young ladies, but never one at the country institutions, which claim to be of equal, if not superior rank ! Thus, for example, the young ladies at Vassar College seemed fond enough of horse-riding and certain other " field sports ; " but if they paid any attention to botany, we neither heard nor saw any evidence of the fact during our late visit to that institution.

Most of our readers are aware that Mrs. Phelps is an eminent educator

as well as the author of several excellent school books. Both herself and her sister, Mrs. Emma Willard, founder of the Troy Female Seminary, have deserved the gratitude of every friend of female education in this country. These ladies belong to the class of competitors of men who deserve to be revered and honored—a class who are, indeed, masculine in intellect and knowledge, but at the same time eminently feminine in modesty and delicacy. Neither of the sisters can now be much less than seventy years of age. Each established an educational institution, which was famous under her auspices. Both those institutions, we believe, still exist, but neither has the reputation it once had.

Mrs. Willard's Seminary was the first female institution we visited in this country; and our impression of it was, after having been present at several of its recitations, that it compared favorably with the best similar institutions of Europe. This is some twenty years ago. At this time it had no superior in America; but soon after Mrs. Willard had to retire from delicate health. Not many years had elapsed when it became too evident that the presiding genius of the seminary no longer directed its studies. We have been reminded of this falling off by the forcible remark of Mrs. Lincoln in the first paragraph noted above as to the character of the change which has taken place since the days of Linnaeus. Who will deny that a similar sort of "*progress* has been the cause of a *retrograde movement*" in female education?

Acta ex iis descripta quæ apud Sanctam Sedem geruntur. In Compendium opportunè redacta et illustrata. Fit evulgatio singulis mensibus. Fasciculus XLIX. Volumen Quintum. Baltimore: Typis Kelly, Piet Et Soc., MDCCCLXIX.

This is a much more interesting publication than the general reader would be likely to infer from its title. Those unfamiliar with the language of Cicero and Tacitus may be informed that it is a monthly Latin periodical, published at Rome, containing reports, more or less condensed, of the principal cases brought before the ecclesiastical tribunals, including the sacred college, from all parts of the world. It also contains copies of all the ecclesiastic decrees, or bulls and encyclical letters, issued by the pope.

The work is now republished in Baltimore by Messrs. Kelly, Piet & Co., to whom we are indebted for the two last numbers, and who, we think, deserve much credit for their enterprise in undertaking to reprint a periodical the circulation of which must necessarily be very limited, although if these numbers had reached us in time we could have satisfied our readers that there are very few monthlies which will be read with a more lively interest, at least by those catholics who understand the language. Even now, at the eleventh hour, when we are preparing to go to press, we will make an observation or two which, we think, will fully bear us out in our opinion as to the interest which the *Acta* is capable of

exciting. Thus, among the articles in No. XLIX., are a report of a great divorce case, and one of the suspension and trial of a priest; a decree from the Congregation of the Index declaring several books condemned, etc., etc.

The first article in No. L. is an elaborate discussion of the claims of St. Julia of Belgium to be recognized as a saint by the universal church, whereas the lady has hitherto been recognized only as a Belgian, or local saint. The archbishop of Malines petitions the pope to render this honor to Belgium, and his petition is strongly supported by the queen of the Belgians, who claims the favor on the twofold ground of her being a daughter of the Hapsburgs, and a queen. Her majesty writes naively to his Holiness, urging "that since Belgium, so fecund in saints, has hitherto had none publicly honored by the whole church, that privation ought now to be removed by the universal recognition of the holy St. Julia. The report of this case occupies twenty pages in the *Acta*; it is certainly a learned and curious paper—one that discusses the subject of canonization from the earliest records of the church; and as the claims of St. Julia were found beyond dispute, the prayer of the petitioners was granted, and henceforth the Belgians will find their chief saint acknowledged as such in every catholic country they may visit.

None must think that we mention these facts in any sneering spirit. It is true that we are not a believer in modern saints, but we respect both the opinions and feelings of those who are. Besides, we hold that when either men or women have led an exemplary life and proved benefactors to their contemporaries, there is nothing absurd or reprehensible, but the contrary, in their being distinguished and honored after their death. Our protestant education does not prevent us from believing that there is really good in it; but the good is not to the virtuous and benevolent who have passed away, but to the living, whom it is the duty of the church to encourage by honoring the memory of the good and great of other days.

But there is one thing in the *Acta* which gives us no little concern. We fear that one of our Jesuit college presidents has got into trouble. The full name of the clergyman is not given, but among the things laid to his charge are ignorance and an undue proclivity for speech making! The report before us goes on to say that for these reasons he is less fit to give instruction than he should be, although in other respects his character is blameless:

"Imo argumenta habere, Bernardum bonis moribus esse præditum, cum eius adversarii non valuerint eum pravorum morum ininimulari: se tamen existimare necessaria scientia in theologia morali cum esse destitutum, et minus idoneum ad instructionem."

This seems to point rather plainly in a certain direction—we only hope we may be mistaken. At all events, we shall look with considerable interest to the next number of the *Acta*. The work will prove an excellent thing for some of our colleges, if the professors will only learn to read it.

* *Acta*, No. XLIX., vol. v., *Suspensionum*, p. 13.

Mitchell's New Reference Atlas, for the use of colleges, libraries, families and counting-rooms, in a series of fifty-six copperplate maps, exhibiting the several countries, empires, kingdoms, and states in the Modern and Ancient World. Compiled from the latest authorities. Quarto. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1869.

The readers of this journal are well acquainted with the superior merits of Mitchell's whole series of geographies and atlases. It were superfluous, therefore, to describe the work now before us; suffice it to say, that the title page, which we have copied in full, does not in the least exaggerate its value. The maps are finely engraved, printed on thick white paper, and tastefully colored; the boundaries are everywhere plainly and accurately indicated; in short, we find nothing omitted that could reasonably be expected even in a reference atlas. The geographical tables at the end of the volume embrace every variety of geographical information which it is possible to convey in a tabular form; and the style in which the work is gotten up is fully commensurate with the value of its multifarious contents.

New Exposition of the Science of Knowledge. By J. G. FICHTE. Translated from the German, by A. E. KROEGER. Pamphlet, pp. 182. St. Louis, Mo. 1869.

This is one of the several expositions of the Science of Knowledge which have contributed so much to the fame of the author as a philosopher. Fichte is one of the boldest and most original of the great German thinkers, and he has found a faithful and zealous interpreter in Mr. Kroeger, who has translated several of his most remarkable works. We take pleasure in recommending the present pamphlet to those who wish to be initiated, in an agreeable and instructive manner, into the peculiar philosophical system of Fichte.

HISTORY AND TRAVELS.

1. *The Polar World; a Popular Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe.* By Dr. G. HARTWIG, author of "The Sea and its Living Wonders," the Harmonies of Nature, &c., with additional chapters, and one hundred and sixty illustrations. 8vo., pp. 486. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.
2. *The Malay Archipelago; the Land of the Orang-Outang and the Bird of Paradise. A Narrative of Travel, with Studies of Man and Nature.* By ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE, author of "Travels on

the Amazon and Rio-Negro," "Palm Trees of the Amazon," &c. 12mo., pp. 638. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

We place these two works together, because, although entirely different in their general plan and style, they frequently serve to illustrate each other by the striking contrasts which they exhibit. One is devoted to the coldest regions of the earth, the other to a portion of the hottest. The author of the one depends on his researches among the works of others for his facts; he places under contribution every navigator, explorer and traveller, to whom the world is indebted for any interesting or useful information relative to the polar regions—their climate, their geological, meteorological and botanical characteristics, their inhabitants, their wild and domestic animals, their birds, &c.; and it must be admitted that he has made judicious use of so large and valuable a mass of materials.

We do not mean by this that Dr. Hartwig is a mere compiler; this would be unjust, for, on the same ground, our best historians might be called compilers, since none of them have been able to visit even those scenes which they have described most graphically and most truthfully; none of them have been present at those great battles, or other startling occurrences, in regard to which all posterity regards them as authorities. But the author of "The Polar World" does not merely present us the facts in his own language, except where he gives a quotation here and there, which is duly credited to the source from which it is taken; he clothes those facts in a popular and attractive garb, so that almost "he who runs may read." It is this characteristic which causes his former works to be so much more extensively read than any recent similar works.

The work of Mr. Wallace, on the other hand, embodies chiefly the results of actual observation. But although he has travelled, studied and investigated, he has not overlooked the efforts of those who have gone before him. Although Dr. Hartwig is by no means inattentive to the teachings of science, but presents us many curious and interesting scientific facts, incidentally, he does not make the study of nature a prominent object, as Mr. Wallace does. A remark, or two, will be sufficient to explain what the chief aim of the latter was. He tells us in his preface that he has adopted "a geographical, zoological and ethnological arrangement," that he "travelled about fourteen thousand miles within the Archipelago, and made sixty or seventy journeys," and occupied about six years, in collecting specimens of natural history, securing a grand total of 125,660 specimens. His essay on the races of man in the Malay Archipelago is a valuable contribution to ethnological science; and still more valuable is the appendix, in which we are presented with a highly interesting dissertation on the crania and languages of those races. In order to give an idea of the attention Mr. Wallace has bestowed on comparative philology, we may mention

that he presents us the equivalents of nine familiar English words, in fifty-nine different languages of the Archipelago.

Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that Mr. Wallace's book is not attractive, as a whole, to the general reader. Even its "Physical Geography" is quite readable. But it is in describing the habits, modes of life, and other characteristics of the various species of tropical animals, birds, insects, &c., that Mr. Wallace is most entertaining. Nor must it be supposed that he overlooks the manners and customs of the people, or their religion, or social organization.

At the same time we must not yet lose sight of Dr. Hartwig's book. And what a transition it is from the scenery of one to that of the other ! While in one we find everywhere an exuberance of life ; in the other, nearly all nature is dead and frozen for nine months of the year. While Dr. Hartwig is entertaining us with accounts of whales, walruses, foxes, dogs, reindeer ; or while he is describing those dreary Antarctic solitudes in which the cold is so intense that scarcely any land animal, bird, or even reptile, can exist in them, Mr. Wallace is describing to us the bird of paradise, and various other gay and beautiful species ; still more beautiful butterflies ; or the richest flowers in the world ; or he is amusing us with sketches of the tricks and gambols of various tribes of apes and monkeys, including the ourang-outang.

In one book we find men covered with furs from head to foot, as a necessary condition of existence ; while in the other we find him perfectly naked. It is worthy of remark that the dog is the only animal that is common to the polar and tropical regions described in these two books ; and that neither the intense cold of the former nor the excessive heat of the latter prevents him from being the faithful friend and companion of man. Our authors show that, like man, too, he adapts himself to all kinds of food, as well as to the means of providing it. As the Malay lives principally by hunting, so does his dog, and as the former is prone to pilfering from strangers, so is the latter. In the polar regions, upon the other hand, man has to live chiefly by fishing, and so does the dog, who is as skilful a fisher as his master. Again, while Dr. Hartwig presents the reindeer in all the relations which he bears to man, both as a wild and a tame animal, Mr. Wallace takes similar pains with the ourang-outang, and other members of the ape family. In these descriptions we have another great contrast, which we need hardly say is entirely in favor of the polar animal, although in the wild state one affords the hunter pretty nearly as much sport as the other.

But our limited space in this department will not permit us to enter into details ; and we readily admit that a hasty glance like this can give no adequate idea of works like "The Polar World" and "The Malay Archipelago." Those who would appreciate them must read them, as we have ourselves ; and those of our readers who find the task so en-

tertaining and agreeable, as we have, will thank us for having called their attention to such works, at a time when good books are so much like angels' visits.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Origin and Development of the Art of Pianoforte Manufacturing in the United States. Pamphlet. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck.

We find many facts in this slender *brochure* that are well calculated to encourage young men and to interest all ages, and both sexes. Brief sketches are given of all who have taken a more or less active part, either as manufacturers or inventors, in the improvement of the piano in this country—including Alpheus Babcock, Conrad Meyer, Jonas Chickering, and the Steinways. In this, as well as in many other instances, the last in time is the first in rank! Every intelligent reader is familiar with the course pursued by Peter the Great of Russia when he resolved on making important reforms; it is well known that before he was recognised anywhere as "great," he not only had visited the principal manufactories of France, England and Germany, but had worked as a mechanic at several of them. We learn from the pamphlet before us that the same judicious and shrewd plan was adopted by the Steinways.

"Henry Steinway, the father, and his four sons, Charles, Henry, William and Albert, on their arrival in the new world, most properly resolved first of all to study its habits and customs, and also to obtain a thorough knowledge of the American system of piano manufacturing and doing business, and the points of difference with that of Europe. They justly realized the fact that the first requirements necessary for the carrying on of a successful manufacturing business in a new country, were a thorough knowledge of the language, the habits, tastes and requirements of the people. To effect this desideratum, although Mr. Henry Steinway had brought some capital with him from Germany, *he, with his sons, worked in different New York piano factories*, and it was only after the lapse of nearly three years, that, in the spring of 1853, the father and his four sons commenced business for themselves."

31.

Young men who study the subsequent history—up to the present time—of this family, may learn a useful lesson from it. Be it remembered that it is those who work with their own hands, or cause others to work, especially those who bring educated skill, art, or science to bear upon their labor, who add to the wealth of a country, or what is better, who improve its taste or contribute to its refinement. The success of men of this class is creditable to the community that has enabled them to attain it; whereas in proportion as speculators succeed, they bring discredit on the community which is credulous enough to permit itself to be imposed upon by them. If we are wrong in this let us send our speculators to some of the great industrial exhibitions of the world and see whether they will get gold medals, or even brass medals! But, except under very peculiar circumstances, it will be found that i

this class want gold medals, bronze statues, &c. &c., they must have them manufactured at their own expense.

Many of our readers will be interested to know what is the peculiar character of the improvements which have obtained for the Steinways so many gold medals in all the principal capitals of Europe, and at the same time rendered American pianos so justly famous throughout the world. The chief secret of the melody which seems to charm every connoisseur in musical instruments, is referred to as follows in the pamphlet before us:

"The introduction of a complete double iron frame—the front plate and back brace-frame connected with each other, and cast in one solid piece. One side of this double iron frame is left open, and into it the sounding-board is inserted, being received and sustained in its position by an apparatus consisting of a number of screws which press the outer edges of the sounding-board towards its centre. A clear, powerful, as well as unusually long and ringing tone, of pure and sympathetic quality, combined with unexampled durability and capacity of standing in tune, are the important results obtained by this new invention."

There are few, if any, of our music-loving readers who cannot bear testimony to the wonderful effect of the tone thus produced by skillful hands, and we think there are none who know the Steinways, who would not heartily congratulate them on the eminent success they have attained, and the distinguished honors conferred on them.

-
1. *Teddy's Dream; or, A Little Scepter's Mission.* By EMMA LESLIE.
 2. *The Little Peat Cutter; or, The Song of Love.* By EMMA MARSHALL.
New York: Gen. Prot. Epis. S. S., Union, 1870.

Probably none of our religious societies have done more good than this. It has had the advantage, so rare at the present day, of being managed for many years by really pious men, whose only ambition has been to fulfil their duties faithfully. This is true alike of the Rev. Mr. Harriman, and his successor, Mr. E. M. Duncan; and each has enjoyed the cordial sympathy and co-operation of the Rev. Dr. Carter, the enlightened and liberal editor of the Society's publications. The books published under the auspices of these gentlemen elicited the respect of all denominations.

But it seems that piety, morality and honesty are not the qualities that pay in the Episcopal Church to-day, for its chief society has got into a condition, somewhat similar to that of the Erie railroad, when it was taken charge of by James Fisk, Jr., and his worthy associates. We should wish that the similarity of circumstances had ended here; but as Boston has sent us a disciple of Plutus for one purpose, so has she for the other. As the Erie has fallen into the hands of James Fisk, Jr., & Co., so has the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union fallen into the hands of Edward P. Dutton & Co.

It is true that Mr. Dutton used to dabble somewhat in pious books, in

Boston, years ago ; several books and pamphlets purporting to be of that character, and as the English-speaking French say—"vary mooch so"—bear his imprint. But very few, if any, of them will bear examination. If we are not fully justified in this statement, let our readers judge when we remark that some years ago a married man with a grown family seduced and eloped with his neighbor's wife. The scandal created thereby was great, and not confined to one hemisphere; and nowhere did it create more excitement than in Boston, where the Lothario spent some time in jail.

But one of his first performances, after obtaining his liberty, was to write a book for Mr. Dutton on the Ceremonies of the Church, &c., purporting on the title-page, as well as in the advertisements, to be the work of "A Churchman." Every intelligent person is aware, that except it be otherwise expressly stated, the term "churchman" means clergyman, or ecclesiastic, which the manufacturer of Mr. Dutton's pious book never was; and no one knew the fact better than the publisher. It is not our intention to say one word in this notice against the compiler of the work alluded to, for he has suffered enough, and has always regretted his transgression, but if Dutton has ever repented of his transgressions, we are not aware of the fact. We could add some other facts illustrative of "free love" piety, but we have no wish to do anything more than to show that it is not without reason, we think, that the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union has more to do just now with Plutus than with Christ.

As for the two little books whose titles are given at the head of this notice, they are, of course, not only pious, but "very much so" (!)

APPENDIX.

INSURANCE.

Insurance Reports, (including sundry False Reports) and other Documents.

Published in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, London, &c., during the quarter ending December 20, 1869.

The failure of some English insurance companies since our last issue has caused an extraordinary excitement in this country. Nothing could be more illogical. It ill becomes us to boast of our superior enlightenment as a people, if we get frightened like children because a few insurance failures take place in England! Do failures of any kind taking place in this country frighten the English, or even the most timid nation of Europe?

Our readers will do us the justice to admit that we are not in the habit of boasting of our foresight. We have never made any pretension to the prophetic gift; but many a time, these ten years past, have we predicted just such catastrophes as those of the Albert Life. But when most earnest

in our warnings and most searching in our criticisms, have we never denied that insurance—life insurance especially—is one of the greatest blessings which modern civilization has developed. Nor would we alter this opinion if every English company failed to-morrow, whereas there is not the least danger that any well-managed, honest English company, having sufficient funds to carry on its business, will fail.

But assuming that insurance companies cannot succeed in England, does it follow from this that they cannot succeed in this country? Be it remembered that it is not alone in their laws the two countries differ in relation to insurance, although this difference, by itself, would be quite sufficient to account for the most striking contrast. Far be it from us to deny that the laws of England are, in general, wise and salutary. In no other country are life and property more efficiently protected. But it is notorious that the insurance laws of England form an exception: no other English laws are so defective. There has been but little legislation on the subject at all in England, and this little is almost exclusively in favor of the companies. That is, extensive privileges are allowed to the companies, and scarcely any protection to the public against the abuse of those privileges. Long before the recent failures, it was well known that the companies as well as the public were injured by those partial and defective laws.

Now, why should all this excite, intimidate, or discourage us? We should have no more gloomy forebodings on account of it than if the society of licensed victualers, the guild of master tailors, or any of the various trades' unions of the United Kingdom, had to dissolve because the members thereof neglected to pay their weekly or monthly subscriptions. Just as freely as we admit the general excellence of the laws of England, we admit that many of our own laws are exceedingly defective. Our divorce laws, for example, are more defective than those of any civilized country; but no country has more excellent insurance laws than those of our principal States, especially New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. Had the laws of England afforded the public such protection as those of the four States mentioned afford, it would have been impossible for the Albert and other companies like it to have so long preyed vulture-like upon the public, and finally fallen a victim to its own voracity, for its very greediness betrayed it at last!

But there is another difference between the two countries which exercises a more powerful influence on insurance than even that of the laws. It will be admitted that business of any kind will flourish or decay in proportion to the demand or lack of demand for the advantages it offers. Now, there are many reasons why the benefits of life insurance should be more generally appreciated in this country than in England. In England there is a large privileged class—an hereditary aristocracy. It is this class who possess three-fourths of the wealth of the nation, and they possess it from generation to generation. In general this class need no insurance; many of them regard it as derogatory to them to take a policy.

Then, upon the other hand, it is only the intelligent portion, the unprivileged classes, who are capable of appreciating the benefits of insurance. This is universally admitted; and is not the admission that the masses of our people are more intelligent than the English masses equally universal? No Englishman whose opinion on the subject is of any value denies the fact. It is notorious that there are at least twenty Englishmen who can neither read nor write for every one American who is equally ignorant; and because insurance is undeniably founded on scientific principles, even those whom it is calculated to serve most can appreciate it only in proportion to their intelligence.

If any deny this, let them turn to the continent of Europe for a fuller illustration, and they will find that precisely in proportion as the people are intelligent do they avail themselves of life insurance, and render insurance companies wealthy, solid, and reliable, and *vice versa*. Thus, for example, in no country are there more or better free schools than in Prussia; in no country are the people more intelligent, and accordingly insurance flourishes more in Prussia than in any other country from the Straits of Gibraltar to the White Sea. Again, if we inquire which are the least enlightened nations of Europe—in which does ignorance spread most widely its dark pall—we shall find that it is they that give least encouragement to insurance—that policies of insurance find as bad a market in them as books, periodicals, or scientific instruments. If we confine ourselves to the newspapers, as a criterion—and those who dislike them most must admit that they disseminate an immense amount of useful information—we shall find that for every one Turk or Russian who reads the papers, at least fifty Prussians or Frenchmen read them; and is it not equally true that for every one Turk or Russian who insures either his life or his property, at least fifty Prussians or Frenchmen take the precaution of having both life and property insured.

Why, then, should we get frightened because certain English companies fail? Those very failures should have been expected. Our readers may remember that we had several times predicted them; nor do we claim any particular credit for having done so. The occurrences alluded to, have, therefore, not altered our views in the slightest. Altogether independently of the differences we have pointed out, the English companies that have failed had the closest resemblance, in all essential points, to the American companies whose *modus operandi* we have so often denounced. The English companies which are like the American companies whose good works we have pointed out from time to time as illustrative of the sterling benefits of insurance, have not failed, nor is there the least danger that they will fail. We have now before us a list of thirty-three English companies that have failed; but there are at least twice the number of American companies which may fail any day; and far from their passing out the world being an injury to legitimate insurance, it would be a positive benefit. So many untimely deaths would doubtless cause a panic among

the timid and weak-minded, but judicious, thoughtful men would congratulate the public that only the tares were lost; that we still possessed the pure wheat, and that it was in less danger of adulteration by spurious mixtures than ever.

Thus, for example, we may be entirely mistaken, but we cannot help believing that there are at least a dozen companies whose early demise would be much more a blessing than a misfortune to the public; and in order to give our readers an opportunity of contradicting us, if we are wrong, we beg leave to mention such as the Batterson Cross and Crooked Road Mutual, the Morgan and Barnes Registry and Chamber Mutual, the Banta and Beers New Yahoo Life, the Marshall Infinitesimal Bolus Mutual, the Bage and Shader Great Paste Diamond Mutual, the Bucklin Providential Mutual, the Eadie and Leeds United Stockbroker's Life, the Scribner and Smith Vampire State Mutual, the Cooke and Butler Nondescript Life of the United Stockjobbers, the Widow and Orphan's Balderdash Mutual, etc.

Perhaps some of our readers will think that our English cousins ought to be very much frightened if all these companies would die in more or less rapid succession, notwithstanding the ostentatious display of wealth and consequence made by some of them, and the display of impudence and effrontery made by all. But if they were so easily frightened, would they not render themselves rather ridiculous? Might we not well laugh at them, and tell them that life insurance was not born with the Battersons, the Morgans, the Bantas, the Bages, the Bucklins, &c., and neither would it die with them; that these worthy persons are as much things apart from insurance as the tares are from the wheat.

A leading London journal has mentioned about a dozen of English companies, and said that as long as these are as solvent and strong as they are there need be no alarm, and that there is not the least danger of their being otherwise during the lifetime even of their youngest officers. We can mention about an equal number, and speak with at least equal confidence of their permanency and solidity. For the reasons already mentioned, we should be fully justified in having more confidence in the vitality of our leading companies than the English can logically have in theirs. But this is not necessary, for there are English companies of whose failure we should be as little afraid as that of the Bank of England. More than this it were superfluous to say of our own standard corporations—that is, of about *one* out of every *fifteen* of all that call themselves insurance companies.

These few select life companies we will mention just as their names occur to us, altogether independently of the state, city, or town to which they belong, viz.: The Knickerbocker, the Phoenix Mutual, the Security, the New England Mutual, the Equitable, the *Ætna*, the Manhattan, the New York Continental, the Mutual Benefit, the New York National, the Charter Oak, and the Globe Mutual. We could mention two or three

more, but further we could not proceed without taxing our conscience; although there are very nearly, if not quite, two hundred life companies doing business, or pretending to do business, in this country at the present moment; and there is not one of the worst class of these which is not louder and more arrogant in its pretensions than the best and most honorable of those we have mentioned as worthy of comparison with the model companies of Europe. Even at the close of the year—as the holidays approach—when the insurance business is always more or less dull, we are in possession of sufficient facts and figures to show that no failures—no sensations, however startling—can throw any serious obstacles in the way of those who, let the lighter waves of public opinion foam and fluctuate as they may, are always determined to do right; but before we give any particulars, we will take a hasty glance at another circumstance.

An event of much graver importance to the American public, than the failure of the Albert Life has taken place in the insurance world since our last issue, viz., the resignation of Hon. John E. Sanford, of the office of Insurance Commissioner of Massachusetts. With Mr. Sanford personally we had but a slight acquaintance; but of his official acts and career we have kept advised since it was the good fortune of the "Old Bay State" to secure his services. We have often wondered why it was that Massachusetts obtained such good men in her various governmental departments; for no one but a good and true man could have performed arduous labors so well as Mr. Sanford has, in his particular bureau. The wonder still exists, that although we find offices annually filled by good and true men, whereas a month previous it was hardly supposable a successor could be found.

But little is known of the first insurance commissioners of Massachusetts. We are led to believe they were appointed solely because they were political friends of the then administration (as in the recent instance of Mr. Boutwell, though we suspect that the latter would have got no treasury in Massachusetts to manage without knowing much more about political economy than he does.) They are now forgotten. About fifteen years ago Elizur Wright began to battle, in his trenchant way, for an insurance law which should compel life companies to make returns of all their assets and liabilities, by means of which the state should, for the protection of the insured, set a price upon all life obligations, or, in other words, establish a standard of valuation. He succeeded. The office of insurance commissioner was taken from the arena of politics, and given to him. In it he perfected existing laws, and did yeoman's service in the cause of the widow and orphan. His great mathematical ability in his speciality—unequalled by that of any other person in this country, and if equalled in Europe, certainly not surpassed—was exerted to dispel ignorance and extend knowledge; so that at this late day, even when so much has been written about life insurance, his series of annual reports are acknowledged as text-books upon the subject.

When Mr. Wright retired from the office, to accept the position of consulting actuary to many of our best companies, as well as to obtain a respite from arduous duties, it was thought a successor could not be found. Who John E. Sanford was no insurance man knew! When it was whispered that he was a lawyer in good practice, of liberal education, and of great literary taste, the croakers heralded their fears that the office could never be filled as it had been. Mr. Sanford's first report was looked for with considerable anxiety; and when it came, what a disappointment—agreeable to be seen—fell upon the community! The new man had made his mark; and he went on increasing in knowledge and giving it to the public in good sound Saxon, until it was felt that in Mr. Sanford there was a veritable jewel. And his reports stand to day, on both sides of the Atlantic, models in insurance literature. He was no controversialist, as Mr. Wright was in a certain degree, else had the insurance superintendent of New York been annihilated when, in his last report, he charged Mr. Sanford with unfair dealing in the matter of the attempt to procure a common standard of valuation in the two states. He is proved to have been a sound, practical man, who, during his term of office, exerted himself solely for the public good, and when Mr. Sanford retired with the good wishes of all, the public lost a faithful servant.

It is by the united efforts of such men as Messrs. Wright and Sanford that the insurance laws of Massachusetts stand to-day, as every candid person must admit, above and beyond those of any other state in the Union. They are simple and effective, easily answered, and exhibit the condition of companies in a manner that can be well understood by the public.

Mr. Sanford carries into his retirement the good wishes of the representatives of all the honest life companies of this country, for it is with them he has been most in contact, and he has the proud consciousness of knowing that there lives not a being who can lisp against his reputation a breath of suspicion. His rectitude of conduct, his courteous bearing, and his untiring energy of purpose, were thoroughly exemplified in a most extraordinarily successful official career. May Massachusetts have it always in her power to fill her offices with such men! although there is not one of the higher qualities, either intellectual or moral, for which we have thus most cheerfully given Mr. Sanford credit, in which he does not contrast with the political Massachusetts man who now manages (?) the treasury of the United States. And let any intelligent person compare the official reports of the two men with each other, and what a contrast in every characteristic on which culture, intellectual ability, or knowledge of political economy, or of any other science, may be supposed to exercise any influence!

In no position is an honest man—a man of education and talent, who is not a party hack—more needed than at the head of the insurance department. Had Mr. Sanford done nothing more than to furnish *data*, as

he did, by which the good, bad, and indifferent companies could be distinguished from each other, he would have been entitled to the gratitude of every honest policy-holder. But none appreciate his services more than ourselves, nor are we actuated in entertaining this feeling by vanity or egotism on account of his having fully corroborated—as our readers may see for themselves—the most serious charges we have ever made against the insurance quacks, and for which we have been subjected to the grossest abuse. There is no harm in this, however; far from doing us the slightest injury, abuse from such sources, and for such reasons, always renders us service by gaining us the sympathy of the upright and honorable.

Our readers will remember that there is nothing against which we have more frequently cautioned all whom it might concern than “cheap insurance” and miraculous “new features;” our reason being, that nothing does more mischief among the thoughtless class. We see evidence of this, in various forms, almost daily; and we perceive that some of the insurance journals begin to admit, at last, that parties may have charters as insurance companies and large capitals—at least on paper—and yet be nothing better than swindlers—than those who, seeing an honest farmer going to the bank to deposit his money, would induce him to give it to them for a worthless lottery ticket. The most interesting recent illustration is the following:

“A lady called at the office of the Phoenix Life, at Hartford, and told the president of the company, Mr. Fessenden, that she wished to insure the life of her husband for the sum of five thousand dollars. After making out the application carefully, she inquired what it would cost. Mr. Fessenden, looking at the rate-book before him, said that the premium would be one hundred and fifty dollars. The lady looked up in surprise, and said there was some mistake, and that she wanted to go into a company where she could get a *policy of five thousand dollars for six dollars*. Without a word of explanation, Mr. F. courteously escorted her across the hall into an office of one of those co-operative mutual benefit humbugs, which flourish so strangely in Hartford, and, bidding her good morning, left her to be persuaded that she could get a great deal of ‘cheap insurance’ for a very cheap price.”*

If the “cheap insurance” were confined to Hartford it were less matter. It is not difficult, however, to explain how it is that the spurious may flourish for a time, even in so small a city, comparatively, as Hartford. The standard companies there have done so much good that the very name of the city has a prestige which inspires confidence throughout the country; and whatever hallucination the lady referred to labored under, in regard to cheapness, if she wanted a true policy at a fair price, she could not have called on a more reliable underwriter for that purpose than either the president or the secretary of the Phoenix Mutual. This company, like every other of its class that is old enough to be sufficiently known, can afford to maintain its dignity, for it receives applications enough from those willing to pay a fair price for a genuine article.

Had the lady gone to the Connecticut Mutual, the Connecticut General, or to either of Batterson’s concerns, her six dollars might have procured

* *N. E. Ins. Gazette* for Oct., p. 929.

her a paper nearly large enough to make a cloak or a blanket for her; but whether it would ever have rendered herself or her posterity any other service would depend on more conditions and circumstances than we have time or space at present to enumerate.

But had she gone to the Aetna Life, or the Charter Oak Life, we think the reply given her would not have been very different from that of the Phoenix. Both Mr. Enders and Mr. Walkley are also fond of a joke. What the latter has been doing lately, we are not aware, but the former could have informed the lady that the number of policies issued at legitimate prices by the Aetna, during 1869, will reach about 11,000; that its receipts during the same period will have been over \$6,000,000; and that its assets on the first of January, 1870, will be about thirteen millions and a half (\$13,500,000).

Glancing at Boston before returning to New York, we find the New England Mutual as dignified, progressive and prosperous as ever. It has recently issued three characteristic circulars; one to its medical examiners and two to its policy holders. One of the latter announces important alterations in policies, and the other gives notice of the abandonment, on the part of the company, of the premium note system, from and after February 1, 1870. Several reasons are assigned for the abandonment, one of which we extract, only premising that, while those reasons are substantial and satisfactory, other companies may do good and honorable business under the note system as the New England itself has done hitherto:

"1. The payment of cash is the most economical mode of settling small premiums, so far as time, trouble, and actual expense are concerned, by keeping life insurance within appropriate limits, and compelling a person to take a policy only for that amount for which he can absolutely pay at the time. Thus the transaction becomes a fair and square investment from year to year. There being no interest to pay, and no accumulated notes to be talked over and explained, everything is easily understood. The assured pays his annual premium, and receives the second year whatever the company, by its good fortune, can return him. No more extended statement of the true relation between members of the company and its executive is needed."

None can object to this, and we do not apprehend that any will. We only wish that the "cheap" insurers would act so honestly and frankly as the New England Mutual does in all cases. If they did, there would be no danger that insurance would fall into disrepute.

But it is often the companies that act most generously which are most calumniated, for there are a class of underwriters who cannot bear to see themselves cast into the shade by those who are more energetic as well as more honorable. This feeling has recently subjected the Knickerbocker Life to many attacks; but it seems rather to thrive upon them. Not more than two or three companies in the United States—if so many—have done more business than the Knickerbocker during the past year, for we learn from a reliable source that from December 1, 1868, to December 1, 1869, it issued 9,300 policies, insuring \$6,000,000. This is the sort of work which certain ambitious companies, fond of display, es-

pecially in the shape of white marble, at the expense of their policy holders, cannot endure. Mr. Elizur Wright being somewhat of a wag, as well as a mathematician and insurance philosopher, affects to believe that a certain recent attack on the Knickerbocker is merely the work of an obscure insurance journal published somewhere "out west," and calling itself a "Review." Without pausing to inquire who inspired the insurance journal, Mr. Wright ridicules every one of its insinuations in a letter to the esteemed president of the Knickerbocker, from which we extract the following paragraph :

"The attempts of the "Review" to disparage the Knickerbocker by comparing its ratios of reserve to risk, and of total expenditure to total income, with the like ratios of other companies, are either a display of its own ignorance or a presumption of the ignorance of the public—for the comparison proves nothing, unless all other things are equal—calling they could be only by one chance in many millions, in regard to any two companies."

None who understand the subject will deny this. Mr. Lyman, with characteristic frankness, refers to their true source the representations alluded to, although he does not mention names. "Honorable competition," he truly remarks in one of his circulars, "is praiseworthy, and when an institution or its agent seeks to malign and injure another by scattering, broadcast, *anonymous circulars full of misrepresentations and falsehoods, they should be despised and avoided by honorable business men.*"

Since underwriters, whose conduct towards the widow and the orphan are most exemplary, are thus attacked by members of their own fraternity, it is no wonder that many who are disposed to insure their lives, but have not perception enough to perceive the influence of envy or jealousy, shake their heads mysteriously, and express their doubts of the whole system; for our readers may remember that it is not long since we deemed it our duty to the public to denounce similar attacks made, in turn, on several other standard companies.

It is but rarely that rivals conscious of their own strength and power are so ungenerous as to make such attacks as those so justly characterized by Mr. Lyman—*never*, we think, when their strength and power are the results of intelligence, energy, and perseverance, combined with integrity. If companies or individuals of this character do fall out—as the most peaceful and honorable may occasionally misunderstand each other—they are pretty sure to arrange their difficulties without coming to any open rupture. Thus, for example, no company is stronger than the Equitable; it is not too much to say that it is as solid as its own new and magnificent granite palace; no company has acquired its strength in a manner more in accordance with the conditions just mentioned. Some time since it had a misunderstanding with the Knickerbocker; but the officers of both companies being sensible, as well as honorable men, the affair was soon amicably arranged.

It is but justice to Mr. Franklin to say that as long as he was the real manager of the New York Life, it was a respectable company; but since Beers, Appleton, and Banta obtained the ascendancy there has been a

melancholy falling off—a falling off which no amount of white marble; no issue, however immense, of circulars, with or without the name of the company, will be likely to counteract. Even the almanacs distributed in thousands after the manner of the quack doctors, as if policies were pills or boluses, will hardly do.

In our opinion, all this is wrong. And if we turn to any of the companies which, far from having recourse to any *imposing* display or clap-trap, are famed for their modesty, we shall find that they bear the brunt of anti-insurance sensations much better than their pompous and braggart rivals. Take the Security Life as an instance. We have never heard that this company quarrelled with any one; it has never shown itself in the least tainted with either envy or jealousy. But is it the worse for this? The best answer will be found in the following brief record of its business for the year just about to close, as compared with that of last year:

	<i>New Policies.</i>	<i>Insuring.</i>
1869.....	6,337	\$16,577,105
1868, war.....	4,386	11,561,389
Increase.....	\$1,951	\$5,015,716

It will puzzle all the circular manufacturers and almanac compilers of the New York Life to exhibit a similar state of things. As to the Mutual Life, we think we may overlook its performances this time. If the memorable "whitewashing" process has had the desired effect, others may have recourse to the same contrivance. In the meantime, we have really no ill-will towards the Mutual Life, or any other company. We would recommend Mr. Winston and his colleagues to our readers tomorrow, just as cheerfully as we would any other underwriters, if we could only see that their improved conduct towards their policy-holders deserved it. But until we have some satisfactory evidence that an improvement has really taken place, and a very decided one, we think it vastly honest to recommend companies like the Mutual Benefit (N. J.), the Manhattan, the N. Y. National, the N. Y. Continental, the Commonwealth Mutual, &c., in addition to the standard corporations indicated above. We are here reminded, on turning to some of the documents before us, that the Manhattan has just issued a small pamphlet, giving new "Tables of Rates and Terms." Turning over its pages, we find an outline of the company's career, from which we extract the following passage, with the remark, in passing, that we have long been in the habit of receiving the statements of the Manhattan with implicit confidence:

"Twenty years successful business has placed it among the leading companies in amount of business, while its conservative management commends it to the confidence of insurers as the strongest and best company in the country. Its claims by death, during the year 1868, amounted to only \$12,500 on the amount of new policies issued during the year, showing great care in selecting risks. Its ratio of expenses for conducting its business was among the lowest.

Its Gross Assets Jan. 1st, 1869, were.....	\$5,262,348
Its Gross Liabilities were.....	4,335,310

Leaving a surplus of..... \$927,038

Showing a larger per centage than any other company in this state."

The National Life (N. Y.) is an offshoot of the Manhattan, and the offspring continues to be worthy of the parent. The National is not a large or plethoric company, but it is an intelligent, energetic, honest, and progressive company. Its president and vice-president are men of decided ability, and rank, by common consent, among our most experienced and shrewdest underwriters. Accordingly, notwithstanding the various panics of the year, the National has increased its business during 1869, as compared with that of 1868, nearly 100 per cent. May we not wish, then, *sine ullo maleficio*, that Batterson, Morgan,* Bage, Eadie, Beers, Cooke, Bucklin, *et hoc genus omne*, would take a few lessons from them, but more especially as to the difference between promises and performances, and between what is real and tangible and what is merely imaginary.

If Mr. Jones and his colleague should be too busy to give private lessons to so many pupils who are not very quick at learning, perhaps Messrs. Lawrence and Rogers of the Continental could give them a hand. We could recommend Mr. Wynkoop for the same purpose, especially so far as patience and good temper are concerned; but we are too well aware that any one who has a score or two of modern printers to regulate, cannot have much time or taste, however charitably inclined, for teaching quack underwriters. It is evident, however, that the three gentlemen mentioned find time to secure the steady progress of their own company, for we learn that during the month of November last it issued 902 policies, for an annual premium of \$93,814, and that the total number of policies issued since the organization of the company amounted to 19,198 at the first of December instant.

Our confidence in the Continental led us to expect good things for the widow and orphan, from its progeny, which already bids fair to be pretty numerous. We have every reason to believe that in one case our expectations will be fully realized. Far from having any cause to recede from our first impression of the Commonwealth Life, although we admit it was quite sanguine, its recent progress, and the straightforward manner in which it has been attained, have not only made us cling to that opinion, but rendered us more sanguine still. We do not pretend, however, to be infallible in our impressions—especially of companies so young as the Commonwealth, and therefore will say no more until we see its January statement—except that we expect much from that document. It is otherwise, however, in our estimation, with its twin brother or step-brother, although we hope, for the sake of its parent as well as that of the widow and orphan, that it will not justify the title of *Vampire Mutual*, instead of Empire Mutual, which we perceive some have given it already, and yet we must admit we have no good reason to deny the justice of the new christening. But should even the worst happen, it should be remembered that the best parents have often the worst children. None of the new companies makes less pretensions than the Anchor Life; but thus far, it seems preferable to any of the others, except the Commonwealth.

Speaking of the family relations reminds us that, although the Mutual Benefit, (N. J.) like the Knickerbocker, Phoenix Mutual, New England Mutual, Security Life, and Aetna Life, has recently had onslaughts made upon it in various quarters, we see that, like the same corporations, it has recently afforded new proof of its having a true soul, as well as a pretty large, strong body. We allude to an occurrence which is sufficiently described in a letter, dated September 15, 1869, to Mr. Webb, its Baltimore agent, which we find in a recent number of the "Baltimore Underwriter," and which we copy *infra*, as an illustration of the manner in which the American companies we regard as honest and faithful vindicate life insurance.*

No underwriter is more abused, just now, than Mr. Charles Holland, of the Eagle Life, of Chicago, the ancient and sturdy antagonist of Batterson, the well-known cross-roads insurer of Hartford. We do not pretend to have any particular knowledge of his company, but we think it rather odd that one of the charges made against him is, that, whereas, he should have been all the time absorbed in insurance, if he did not mean to cheat, he has been so careless and forgetful of his duty of late as to write a novel! Now we confess that we rather like him for this; but before coming to any conclusion on the subject, we took the precaution of reading the work. We have never counted either the capital or the assets of the Eagle, but we have carefully examined Mr. Holland's "Aspasia," and our opinion of it will be found in our last number. Whatever the company may be—and we certainly know nothing bad of it—the book, far from being a reproach, does credit to its author. In our opinion, it is vastly more honorable for an underwriter, or anybody else, to write such a book, and prefix his name to it, as Mr. Holland has done, than to write anonymous circulars, stuffed with all sorts of vile misstatements against his rivals in business.

We have but little to say, at this time, on either fire or marine insurance. In both there have been large losses; but those of the insured who exercised ordinary precaution in choosing their policies will be fully indemnified. Not one insured in a good, honest company will lose a penny; and if our readers do not know which companies possess those characteristics it is their own fault, for we have often indicated them. Without any pretensions to infallibility, in our discussions of fire or marine insurance, more than in those of life insurance, we think we can claim the credit of being able to distinguish the honest from the dishonest, when we make careful researches for that purpose; and we can truly

* "Dear Sir: We acknowledge the receipt, this day, of the value of policy for \$10,000, which is in full settlement of claim on the life of the late Henry Pendexter, and we take pleasure in testifying to the promptness and entirely satisfactory way in which your company has paid up this loss, so fully in keeping with its well-established character for promptitude in settling all losses which they may be liable for, and we cordially recommend to all desiring first-class insurance and security, "The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey."

THEODORE S. BANTZ,

JNO. K. CALWELL,

Assignees.

say that, without having done so—without having informed ourselves, as fully as possible, by legitimate and honorable means—we have never condemned any company or association; nor have we been less careful in qualifying ourselves to do justice to integrity and worth. Once in our life we have been mistaken; that was in the case of the Columbian Marine and Morris Fire; we say “once,” because although the names and objects of the two companies were different, they belonged to the one party—their interests were, in fact, identical. Even in this instance the original officers meant well; and when they failed, chiefly from lack of experience, they had injured themselves more than the public.

It may be remembered that at the same time we made some comparisons between the Sun Mutual (Marine), and the Mercantile Mutual (Marine), long before the “scrip dividends” of the former had proved worthless. When the president of the Sun was promoted to the custom-house, we said nothing, but we confess that our thoughts on the subject were not very complimentary either to the new functionary or to those who appointed him. Not that we were at all surprised at the appointment, for in our mind there is some resemblance—though it may be distant—between spurious scrip dividends and political dinners, electioneering speeches, etc. What has happened since at the custom-house; how one “scrip” person was allowed to resign, and how another (an individual formerly recommended from the office of the Moon Mutual), was promoted to be the right hand man and adviser of his highness the collector, are things which need not be commented upon here. We will only ask has anything of this kind stained the fair fame of the Mercantile Mutual, or its president? Has the Security (Fire and Inland), or any of its three presidents been caught in the manufacture of worthless scrip, or in the performance of any other suspicious thing?

Those ready to judge the motives of others by their own may say that it is because the Washington, the Hope, the Security, the Aetna (Hartford), etc., are our friends that we recommend them to our readers. But, assuming this to be the case, does it render their integrity and reliability anything the less valuable to the public? If, in travelling in a neighborhood which happens to be infested with brigands, somebody refers us to one who will protect us, does this protection lose any of its value when we learn that our protector has also protected, or in some other manner befriended, the person who pointed him out to us?

For a similar reason, those who are criticised, are very apt to pretend that it is because the critic has some deadly spite against them—at best because they are not his patrons or friends. Now there are at least a dozen fire companies in this city, with which we have never found the slightest fault, although so far as we are aware, not one of them has ever rendered us the smallest service. Take the Hanover for example. This company has been doing a large business in New York for seven-

teen years. We were quite aware of its existence ten years ago; but who can say that we have charged it with any improper conduct? Had we known it to be guilty of such, it would have been otherwise; but we have never heard the most censorious express the least doubt of its integrity. Accordingly we are now glad to have an opportunity of informing our readers, that the Hanover has a surplus fund of \$300,000, together with a capital of \$400,000; that it has never passed a dividend, and that its average annual dividend for seventeen years amounts to 12 per cent. It would be superfluous to say that a company having this record is judiciously managed; suffice to remark, therefore, that Mr. Walcott and Mr. Lane, its president and vice-president, deserve to be ranked with underwriters like Walker, Walter, Hendee, Lothrop, Reese, Hastings, Saterlee, &c., men constituting a guild that has nothing to fear from criticism or publicity, but which is all the more friendly on this account.

LORD & TAYLOR,

ARE NOW OFFERING

AT RETAIL,

AN ENTIRELY NEW AND DESIRABLE STOCK OF

Fashionable Dry Goods

SUITABLE FOR

FALL AND WINTER.

THE SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS, VIZ. :

Dress Goods,

Cloaks and Mantillas,

Silks,

Mourning,

Cloths,

Upholstery,

Shawls,

Gloves,

Ladies' and Gentlemen's Furnishing.

HAVE BEEN NEWLY AND COMPLETELY STOCKED,

AND THE

LATEST PARIS AND LONDON NOVELTIES

WILL BE FOUND IN EACH.

In great variety and at very low price.

LORD & TAYLOR,

461 to 467 Broadway, cor. Grand St.

251 to 257 Grand St., cor. Chrystie St.

"This corporation (The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States) can be said to mark and distinguish the commencement of the recent astounding progress in the business of Life Insurance."—WILLIAM BARNES, Superintendent of N. Y. Ins. Department, Report, 1868.

THE
EQUITABLE
 LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY
 OF THE UNITED STATES,

No. 92 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

WM. C. ALEXANDER,
 President.

HENRY B. HYDE,
 Vice-President.

GEORGE W. PHILLIPS,
 Actuary.

JAMES W. ALEXANDER,
 Secretary.

Cash Assets, nearly **\$9,000,000**
 Annual Premium Income **5,500,000**

SUM ASSURED (NEW BUSINESS) DURING THE YEAR
 ENDING JAN. 31, 1869,

\$52,000,000.

It issues all desirable Non-Forfeiting Policies on a Single
 Life, from \$250 to \$25,000.

All Profits divided among Policy-holders annually from the start.

ITS FIVE MODES OF APPLYING DIVIDENDS ARE: Permanent Increase of Policy, Term Increase of Policy, Permanent Reduction of Premium, Term Reduction of Premium, Limitation of Number of Premiums to be Paid.

These concessions are made by no other Company. Its comparative rank as to new business done since its organization, among all American Companies, stand as follows:

In 1860, it was the **NINTH**.

In 1864 and 1865, the **SIXTH**.

In 1861, the **EIGHTH**.

In 1866 the **FOURTH**.

In 1862 and 1863, the **SEVENTH**.

In 1867 (the fiscal year), the **SECOND**.

It is the most Successful Company ever organized, and, for its years, the **LARGEST MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY IN THE WORLD**.

To secure a Policy in the Equitable, apply at the Office, No. 92 Broadway, New York, or to any of the Society's Agents throughout the United States.

Agents wishing to represent the **EQUITABLE** are invited to make application for appointment, by letter, to the New York Office.

HUGH B. JACKSON, GROCER,

IMPORTER AND DEALER IN

WINES, TEAS, GROCERIES, FRUITS,

[Sauces, Condiments,

TABLE & HOUSEHOLD ARTICLES,

ETC., ETC., ETC.,

192 Fifth Ave., Madison Square,

NEW YORK.

Families may always rely on getting at our store the best Goods in our line the American market affords, at reasonable prices.

Goods Delivered free in any part of the City.

**ORDERS FROM ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY
PROMPTLY ATTENDED TO.**

Our facilities for importation are such that we can afford to sell the best Wines, Brandies, Teas, Fruits, &c., &c., at the lowest rates they can be procured in the country.

CHARTER OAK LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Assets, \$6,000,000.

Annual Income, over \$4,000,000.

ANNUAL DIVIDENDS. DIVIDENDS GUARANTEED.

Policies Issued 40,000. Losses Paid, \$2,000,000.

Dividends Paid, over \$2,000,000.

Those intending to obtain Insurance, are urged to consult our Agents, and examine the merits of this Company.

NOYES S. PALMER, General Agent. JAMES C. WALKLEY, President
183 Broadway, New York.

THE Hope Fire Insurance Co.

OFFICE NO. 92 BROADWAY.

CASH CAPITAL, - - - - - \$150,000

NET ASSETS, Dec. 1868, - - - - - 223,282

SURPLUS July 1st, 1869, - - - - - 80,083

The advantages offered by this Company are fully equal to any now offered by other reliable Companies, comprising a liberal commission to Brokers, placing entire lines of Insurance with customary Rebate to Assured, and prompt settlement of losses.

Board of Directors:

HENRY M. TABER,
H. S. LEVERICH,
T. W. RILEY,
ROBERT SCHILL,
S. CAMBERLENG,
WM. H. TERRY.

JOSEPH FOULKE,
JOSEPH GRAFTON,
CYRUS H. LOUTRELL,
AMOS ROBBINS,
JACOB REESE,
J. W. MERSEREAU.

L. B. WARD,
D. L. EIGENBRODT,
D. LYDIE STYDAM,
WILLIAM REMSEN,
F. SCHUCHARDT,
STEPHEN HYATT.

JACOB REESE, President.

JAMES E. MOORE, Secretary.

CITY OF NEW YORK.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.

Bureau of the Receiver of Taxes,

COURT HOUSE, PARK,

32 CHAMBERS ST., Dec. 6, 1869.

TO TAXPAYERS:

Notice is hereby given that an additional one per cent. will be added on the 15th inst. to all taxes unpaid previous to that day.

On the 1st of January following, interest at the rate of twelve per cent. will be added, to be calculated from the 7th day of October, 1869, to the date of payment.

BERNARD SMYTH, Rec.

ÆTNA INSURANCE CO.,

INCORPORATED 1819. CHARTER PERPETUAL.

CASH CAPITAL, \$3,000,000.

Losses Paid in 50 Years, - - \$24,000,000

ASSETS, JANUARY 1, 1869,

(At Market value.)

Cash in hand and in Bank	\$592,629 57
Real Estate	233,519 14
Mortgage Bonds	894,700 00
Bank Stock	1,397,330 00
United States, State, and City Stock, and other Public Securities	2,102,953 00
Total	\$5,110,951 71

LIABILITIES.

Claims not due, and unadjusted, . . . \$289,553 98

L. J. HENDEE, President.

WM. B. CLARK, Ass't Sec'y.

J. GOODNOW, Sec'y.

E. J. BASSETT, GENERAL AGENT.

J. C. HILLARD,	} SPECIAL AGENTS.
H. L. PASCO,	

The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company,
NEWARK, N. J.
ORGANIZED 1845.
ASSETS: OVER \$16,500,000.
Charter Perpetual. Strictly Mutual.
LEWIS C. GROVER, President.

Life Policies of every class issued on the most favorable terms. Purely mutual; no Stockholders control its business or share its profits. It is conducted exclusively by the insured members to whom it belongs.

All the Directors attend regular meetings of the Board and supervise the business. Each one is member of an acting Committee, meeting often for the same purpose. No Director or Officer is allowed to receive commissions on business or loans.

Careful in selecting risks, the Company guards the lives of its members. It does not encourage exposures known to be hazardous to health or life. It does not knowingly give permits to violate the laws of God or man. Conducted with prudence and care, it loses nothing on its investments. Its expenses are less than those of any other American Company.

All receipts beyond losses, expenses, and obligations are annually returned. Dividends for the surplus are made to the members on the percentage plan. They are large as the largest, and very favorable to new members. They are so made that all can understand how their business is conducted. The Directors earnestly seek the best interests of the insured members.

All who desire to insure in and become members of a Company thus conducted, are invited to do so. Application can be made to the Company, or its agents, who will furnish Publications and Statements without charge.

EDWARD A. STROUD, Secretary.
 AMZI DODD, Mathem'n.

WM. F. DAY, Vice-President.
 BENJ. C. MILLER, Treasurer.

SAMUEL H. LLOYD, State Ag't Eastern District of New York.
137 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Hours for Medical Examination at the Office, daily, from 11 A. M. till 2 1/4 o'clock P. M.

LIFE INSURANCE.

EAGLE INSURANCE CO.,
OF CHICAGO.

Office, Tribune Building,
Corner Madison and Dearborn Streets.

OFFICERS.

IRA Y. MUNN, Pres't. H. E. SARGENT, Vice-Pres't.
C. HOLLAND, Secretary. F. M. HAWES, Actuary.

MEDICAL EXAMINERS.

BENJ. DURHAM, M. D. R. LUDLAM, M. D.

DIRECTORS.

HENRY W. BLODGETT, of Blodgett & Winston, President Milwaukee Railway Co.
 ROBERT HARRIS, General Superintendent Chicago & Quincy Railroad,
 T. R. BLACKSTONE, President Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.
 SAMUEL HALE, of Hale, Ayer & Co., Iron Merchants, 74, 76 and 78 Michigan Avenue.
 JOHN T. LINDEAY, Attorney at Law, Peoria, Illinois.
 H. E. SARGENT, General Superintendent Michigan Central Railroad.
 IRA Y. MUNN, of Munn & Scott, Commission Merchants and Elevator Proprietors
 MATTHEW LAFLIN, Capitalist, 42 and 44 State Street.
 DANIEL THOMPSON, of Flint, Thompson & Co., Commission Merchants, 163 S. Water St., and
 Gen'l Superintendent City Railway.
 CHARLES HOLLAND, Secretary.
 WILLIAM H. PERRY, Vice President Commercial National Bank, and Managing Director Chicago
 and Northwestern Railway.
 WILLIAM H. RAND, of Chicago Tribune Company.

Life Insurance Exclusively.

Office of the Mercantile Mutual Insurance Co.,

No. 35 WALL STREET, NEW-YORK, January 23, 1869.

The following statement of the affairs of the Company on the 31st December, 1868, is submitted in accordance with the provisions of the charter:

Amount of Premiums not marked off December 31st, 1867.....\$361,858 56
 " " " on Policies issued from January 1st to December 31st, 1868. 1,151,421 90

Total Premiums.....**\$1,513,280 46**
 Amount of Premiums marked off as earned December 31st, 1868.....\$1,171,596 63
 Less Returns of Premium.....98,678 23

Net Earned Premiums.....**\$1,072,918 40**
 Paid during same period:
 Losses, (less salvages,) Reinsurance, and Expenses, including estimate of
 Losses not yet ascertained.....754,624 47

Earnings for the Year.....**\$318,293 93**

Cash paid to Stockholders for Interest in July.....\$40,426 45

Cash paid to dealers as an equivalent for the Scrip Dividend of
 Mutual Companies.....116,125 83

The Company has the following Assets:

United States, State, City, and other Stocks.....\$367,800 00
 Loans on Stocks and other Securities.....47,950 00
 Cash on hand and in Banks.....90,384 14
 Cash in hands of Foreign Bankers.....46,172 29
 Interest and Dividends due and not collected.....6,748 83
 Security Notes, not to be used in payment of Premiums, but liable for Losses in
 the same manner as Capital Stock.....300,000 00
 Bills Receivable and Premiums due in Cash or Notes.....613,355 40
 Scrip, Salvages, and Sundry Claims due the Company.....67,011 70

\$1,539,422 36

The Board of Trustees have resolved to pay to the Stockholders an interest dividend of **Three and a half per cent.**, free of Government Tax, on and after Monday, February 1st.

ELLWOOD WALTER, President.

ARCH. G. MONTGOMERY, Jr., Vice Pres.

ALANSON W. HEGEMAN, 2d Vice-President.

C. J. DESPARD, Secretary.

KNICKERBOCKER LIFE INSURANCE CO.,

ERASTUS LYMAN, President.

HOME DISTRICT.

COMPRISING THE

STATES OF NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, RHODE
ISLAND and CONNECTICUT.

H. LASSING, Sup't of Agencies

No. 161 Broadway, N. Y.

MANHATTAN

Life Insurance Company

OF NEW-YORK.

OFFICES, NOS. 156 & 158 BROADWAY.

RECEIPTS DURING THE YEAR 1868.

For premiums, extra premiums, etc.....	\$1,874,796 40
For interest.....	310,327 26
For interest and rents accrued.....	80,216 63
	\$2,265,340 29

DISBURSEMENTS.

Paid Claims by Death on Policies and Bonus, and Payment of Annuities.....	481,835 00
Paid Expenses, Salaries, Taxes, Revenue Stamps, Medical Examiners' Fees, Commissions, etc.....	311,895 12
Paid Dividends, Return Premiums Purchased Policies, and Bonus Interest on Dividends, etc.....	387,023 53
	\$1,180,753 65

ASSETS.

Cash in Bank and on Hand.....	49,911 87
Bonds and Mortgages.....	1,234,055 09
Loans on Policies in force.....	2,033,080 02
(The actuarial estimates of the value of the Policies which secure these notes is about \$2,500,000.)	
United States and New York State Stocks.....	712,005 00
Quarterly and Semi-annual Premiums deferred, and Premiums and Interest in course of collection and transmission.....	649,342 54
Temporary Loans on Stocks and Bonds.....	596,225 00
(Market value of the Securities, \$837,733.)	
Interest due to date and all other property.....	92,318 10
	\$5,567,537 00

HENRY STOKES, President.

C. Y. WEMPLE, Vice President.
S. N. STERRINS, Actuary.

J. L. HALSEY, Secretary.
H. Y. WEMPLE, Assist. Sec'y.

GENERAL AGENTS

GEORGE E. FRENCH, Manchester, N. H., for Maine and New Hampshire.
EVERETT & PIERCE, Boston, Massachusetts, for Eastern Massachusetts.
O. L. SHELDON, Rochester, New York, for Northern New York.
B. J. BALL, Buffalo, N. Y., for Western New York.
J. B. CARR, Philadelphia, Pa., for Philadelphia and Delaware.
J. ADAIR PLEASANTS, Richmond, Va., for Virginia, North and South Carolina, etc.
LEWIS, SPENCER & CO., Cleveland, Ohio, for Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, etc.
GEO. N. REYNOLDS, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, for Wisconsin.
LANDERS & Co., San Francisco, for the Pacific Coast.
W. NISBET & Co., St. Louis, for Missouri.

CITY OF NEW YORK.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE.

BUREAU OF THE RECEIVER OF TAXES, COURT HOUSE, PARK,

No. 32 CHAMBERS ST., Dec. 16, 1869.

Notice is hereby given to all persons who may have omitted to pay their taxes to pay the same at this office before the 1st day of January, 1870.

On and after that date interest at the rate of 12 per cent. per annum, calculated from October 7, 1869, to day of payment will be added.

On the 15th day of January prox., warrants will be issued for the collection of all personal taxes remaining unpaid at that date.

BERNARD SMYTH,

Receiver.

NEW JERSEY, CAMDEN & AMBOY,

AND

PHILADELPHIA AND TRENTON RAILROADS.

GREAT THROUGH LINE WITHOUT CHANGE OF CARS

TO

PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE, WASHINGTON,

AND THE WEST.

For Philadelphia :

Leave foot of Cortlandt St. at 7 & 10 A. M., 12.30, 1, 4, 5, 6.30 & 12 P. M.

Leave Pier No. 1, N. R., at 6.30 A. M. and 2 P. M.

For Baltimore and Washington :

Leave foot of Cortlandt Street at 8.40 A. M., 12.30 and 8.30 P. M.

For Pittsburgh, Chicago and Cincinnati :

Leave foot of Cortlandt Street at 8.40 A. M., 5 and 9 P. M.

Wm. H. GATZMER, Agent

C. & A. R. R. and Tr. Co.

Pennsylvania Central Railroad.

SHORT LINE ROUTE BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST.

Running Cars without Change between

**NEW YORK and CRESTLINE, CHICAGO, COLUMBUS, and
CINCINNATI.**

Through Time both East and West between

NEW YORK and	PITTSBURGH.	- - - - -	17 Hours.
"	"	CINCINNATI.	29 "
"	"	CHICAGO.	35 "
"	"	ST. LOUIS.	46 "

The arrangement of Sleeping Cars by this and connecting roads is such as to afford the utmost convenience to passengers. They run from Supper to Breakfast Stations, passing intervening connecting points without change between New York and Pittsburgh; Altoona and Crestline or Dennison; Pittsburgh and Chicago, Cincinnati, or Indianapolis; St. Louis and Crestline, Columbus, or Cincinnati; New Orleans and Louisville.

ASK FOR TICKETS BY PITTSBURGH.

For sale in all principal Railroad Ticket Offices throughout the country.

HENRY W. GINER,

General Passenger Agent.

EDWARD H. WILLIAMS,

General Superintendent.

Philadelphia, Pa.

SOUTH SIDE RAILROAD OF LONG ISLAND.

ON AND AFTER SEPTEMBER 15.

The trains will leave the Roosevelt and Grand Street Ferries, as follows:

8 A. M., Mail and Passenger for Patchogue. 10 A. M., for Merrick.
3.30 P. M., Express to Patchogue. 4.50 P. M., Accommodation for
Islip; ON SATURDAYS THROUGH TO PATCHOGUE. 6.30 P. M.
for Merrick; Saturdays through to Islip.

All trains connect at Valley Stream for Rockaway.

For further particulars see time tables.

ROBERT WHITE, Sup't.

CORPORATION NOTICE.**SALE OF PROPERTY**

FOR

UNPAID TAXES

AND

Croton Water Rents.

Public notice is hereby given that a sale of Property for unpaid Taxes for the years 1864 and 1865, and the regular rents for Croton Water for the years 1863 and 1864, will take place at auction, at the City Hall, in the city of New York, on THURSDAY, the 4th of November next, at 12 o'clock noon, and continue from day to day until the whole of said property shall be sold, and that a detailed statement of the property so to be sold for unpaid taxes and Croton water rents is published in a pamphlet deposited in the office of the Clerk of Arrears, in the Comptroller's office, also in the office of the Receiver of Taxes of the city of New York, where the said pamphlet will be delivered to any person applying therefor.

By order of

R. B. CONNOLLY, Compt'r.

A. S. CADY, Clerk of Arrears.

City of New York, July 31, 1869.

COMMONWEALTH

Life Insurance Company,

178 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

OFFICERS.

JOHN PIERPONT, *President.*

R. C. FROST, *Secretary and Actuary.*

J. B. PEARSON, *Vice-President.*

F. A. PUTNAM, M. D., *Medical*

A. HUNTINGTON, M. D., *Examiners.*

DIRECTORS.

JOHN L. BROWNELL,
President Open Board of Brokers.

WALTER R. BLAKE,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

CHAS. F. DAVENPORT,
Lockwood & Davenport, Bankers.

FRANCIS E. MORSE,
New Jersey.

J. PIERPONT MORGAN,
Dabney, Morgan & Co., Bankers.

JAMES B. PEARSON,
Vice-President of the Company.

JULIUS R. POMEROY,
Chambers & Pomeroy, Attorneys.

JOHN PIERPONT,
President of the Company.

SETH E. THOMAS,
American Clock Company.

ARCHIBALD TURNER,
Turner Bros., Bankers.

SPECIAL FEATURES:

All Policies issued by the Commonwealth are incontestable from date of issue, and are free from restrictions on travel.

It permits residence anywhere without extra charge, except between Latitude 32 North and the Tropic of Capricorn.

All Policies are non-forfeitable, and participate in the profits of the Company unless otherwise specified.

Dividends are declared annually upon all Policies that have been in force a full year, and are available on payment of the next annual premium.

NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF BOSTON.

Branch Office, 110 Broadway, New York.

Directors in Boston.

SEWELL TAPPAN,
MARSHALL P. WILDER,
JAMES S. AMORY,
CHARLES HUBBARD,
GEORGE H. FOLGER,

HOMER BARTLETT,
FRANCIS C. LOWELL,
DWIGHT FOSTER,
JAMES STURGIS,
BENJ. F. STEPHENS.

BENJAMIN F. STEPHENS,

President.

GEORGE M. GIBBENS,

Secretary.

Accumulation - - - - \$7,000,000

Distribution of Surplus in 23 yrs. \$3,000,000

Losses paid in 23 years, \$3,200,000.

Policies of all descriptions are issued by this Company.

Distributions of Surplus are to be made annually, and payable as
the premiums fall due,

Printed documents pertaining to the subject, together with the report
of the Company for the past year, and tables of premiums, supplied
gratis, or forwarded free of expense, by addressing,

SAMUEL S. STEPHENS,

AGENT AND ATTORNEY FOR THE COMPANY,

No. 110 BROADWAY.

Cor. Pine Street.

NEW YORK.

THE
NEW YORK HOTEL,
BROADWAY,
(OCCUPYING THE WHOLE BLOCK.)
Between Washington Place and Waverly Place,
NEW YORK.

AMID all the modifications which the public taste has undergone, and all the material improvements that have been made during the last ten years, this favorite House has continued to maintain its reputation, as occupying the highest rank among American Hotels.

Its situation combines many advantages both for strangers visiting the city, and for citizens occupied in business, and wishing to avoid the annoyances of housekeeping.

The Astor and Mercantile Libraries, and the Cooper Institute, are in the immediate vicinity of the Hotel; on the other side, the University of New York, Washington Parade Ground, and the Fifth Avenue are equally convenient.

The table is always supplied with every luxury which one of the richest markets in the world can afford. In short, no pains nor expense are spared by the undersigned to contribute to the comfort of their guests, and at the same time make them feel perfectly at home, without the apprehension that they will be required to conform to any needless "regulations."

That these various advantages are appreciated by our patrons is sufficiently proved by the fact that there are several families now at the New York Hotel, who have boarded at it for periods varying from *seven to fifteen years*.

Although few first-class hotels in the world enjoy a larger patronage than the NEW YORK, the proprietors always manage to *reserve* a few superior suites of rooms for families or individuals requiring special accommodations; otherwise it would be useless to make any announcement like the present.

D. M. HILDRETH & CO.,

Proprietors.

ÆTNA INSURANCE CO., HARTFORD, CONN.

INCORPORATED 1819.

CHARTER PERPETUAL.

CASH CAPITAL, \$3,000,000.

Losses Paid in 50 Years, - - \$24,000,000.

ASSETS, JANUARY 1, 1869.

<i>Cash in hand and Bank</i>	\$592,629 57
<i>Real Estate</i>	253,319 14
<i>Mortgage Bond</i>	894,700 00
<i>Bank Stock</i>	1,307,330 00
<i>United States, State and City Stock, and other</i>	
<i>Public Securities</i>	2,102,953 00
<i>Total</i>	\$5,150,931 71

DIRECTORS.

E. A. BULKELEY,
THOMAS K. BRACE,
LEVERETT BRAINARD,
APPLETON R. HILLYER,
JAMES CAMPBELL,

T. O. ENDERS,
AUSTIN DUNHAM,
GURDON W. RUSSELL,
DAN'L W. NORTON,
ROBERT E. DAY.

E. A. BULKELEY, President.

AUSTIN DUNHAM, *Vice-President.*

T. O. ENDERS, Secretary.

H. W. ST. JOHN, *Actuary.*

NEW YORK OFFICE,

Nos. 165 and 167 BROADWAY.

L. MORTON, General Agent.

SAMUEL B. RAYMOND, General Agent,

Western Branch Office, Chicago, Ill.

C. H. BRUSH, Agent and Manager,

PHILADELPHIA OFFICE,

400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Penn.

HANOVER

FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

Office, No. 45 Wall Street.

INCORPORATED 1852.

B. S. WALCOTT, Pres't.

I. REMSEN LANE, Sec'y.

Cash Capital,	-	-	-	\$400,000
Cash Capital and Surplus, over				\$700,000

This Company continues to insure Merchandise, Stores, Dwellings, Household Furniture, Ships in Port and their Cargoes, Rents, Leases, and other insurable property against loss or damage by fire, upon the most reasonable terms compatible with safety.

LOSSES

Have been paid by the Company since its organization, to Policy Holders, amounting in the aggregate to over

ONE MILLION DOLLARS.

AGENCIES IN ALL THE PRINCIPAL TOWNS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Eastern Agency Department,

THOMAS JAMES, Actuary.

Western and Southern Agency Department, "The Underwriters' Agency,"

A. STODDARD, General Agent.

THE
National Life Insurance Company
 OF NEW-YORK.

No. 212 Broadway, Corner of Fulton Street,
 (KNOX BUILDING.)

ASSETS, Jan. 1, '69, \$440,000.

Dividend to Policy-holders, 50 per cent.

SPECIAL ADVANTAGES

OFFERED TO

INSURERS IN THE NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

All Policies non-forfeiting on principle of Massachusetts non-forfeiture Law.

All Policies incontestable after five years.

Note taken for one half the annual premium.

No interest charged on semi-annually or quarterly premiums.

Thirty days' grace allowed in payment of premiums.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

S. M. BEARD,
 S. C. HERRING,
 HENRY CLEWS,
 J. A. DELIN,
 S. T. TRUSLOW,
 ROBERT CROWLEY,
 T. B. VAN BUREN,

ELI BEARD,
 HECTOR TOULMIN,
 W. A. CUMMINGS,
 J. O. HALSEY,
 E. A. JONES,
 H. W. RAYMOND,
 J. C. DIMMICK,

HOWELL SMITH,
 F. H. LUMMUS,
 H. P. FREEMAN,
 JOSEPH WILDE,
 CHARLES CURTIS,
 A. WRIGHT, M. D.,
 W. H. WORTHINGTON.

OFFICERS.

EDWARD A. JONES, President.

JONATHAN O. HALSEY, Vice-Pres.

JOHN A. MORTIMER, Secretary.

JOHN C. DIMMICK, Attorney and Counsel.

HIRAM B. WHITE, M. D., Medical Examiner. Residence, No. 5 Green Avenue near Fulton
 avenue, Brooklyn.—At office daily from 2 to 3 o'clock P. M.

CALL OR SEND FOR CIRCULAR.

Continental Life Insurance Company

OF
NEW YORK.

Office, No. 26 Nassau Street, corner of Cedar.

DIRECTORS.

JAMES B. COLGATE,
of Trevor & Colgate,
Bankers.

C. M. DEPEW,
late Secretary of State.

JUSTUS LAWRENCE,
President.

G. H. SCRIBNER,
Vice-President.

JOSEPH T. SANGER,
Merchant, No. 45 Liberty
Street.

M. B. WYNKOOP,
of Wyndkoop & Hallen-
beck, 113 Fulton Street.

Rev. H. C. FISH, D. D.,
Newark, N. J.

RICHARD W. BOGART,
of O. M. Bogart & Co.,
Bankers.

LUTHER W. FROST,
New-York.



OFFICERS.

President,

JUSTUS LAWRENCE.

Vice President,

G. H. SCRIBNER.

Secretary,

J. P. ROGERS.

Actuary,

R. C. FROST.

Medical Examiner,

E. D. WHEELER, M. D.

Profits of the Company Annually Divided.

ONE-THIRD OF THE PREMIUM MAY REMAIN UNPAID AS
A LOAN.

NO NOTES REQUIRED.

Policies Non-Forfeitable.

THIRTY DAYS' GRACE ALLOWED IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.

INSURED MAY TRAVEL IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD
WITHOUT EXTRA CHARGE.

Policies issued.....	12,600
Assets,.....	\$2,300,000
Dividend Declared Jan. 30, 1869.....	40 per cent.

ANCHOR Life Insurance Company, 178 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

OFFICERS.

EDMUND C. FISHER, President.

J. B. CHURCH, Jr., Secretary.

JAMES GOPSILL, Vice-President.

Special Features.

The company invites particular attention to the following new and important features, which are *original* with, and *peculiar* to it.

1. It was the first company in the United States which *guaranteed* policy-holders a *definite cash surrender value* for their policies; at the same time affording a rule by which they may know what such surrender value may be.

2. It is the *only* company which *guarantee* the policy-holder his *dividends* even if the policy should lapse, and declares them to be non forfeitable.

N. B.—A clause is inserted in *every policy* by which these advantages are *distinctly specified and guaranteed*.

Other Advantages to Insurers.

The *lowest rate of premium* of any mutual company in American, being equal to a *dividend in advance* of about fifteen per cent.

All policies *non forfeiting after two annual payments on terms guaranteed in the same*.

It will *loan on its policies* after two annual payments.

It declares and pays *annual dividends*.

It gives *THIRTY DAYS' GRACE in payment of premiums*, and the policy is held good during that time.

It has removed all restrictions on travel or residence.

SECURITY Insurance Company, 119 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

♦♦♦
JANUARY 1st, 1869.

Capital.....	\$1,000,000 00
Surplus.....	706 611 91
Total Assets.....	\$1,706,611 91
Liabilities, \$119,231 03	

A. F. HASTINGS, PRESIDENT.

W. B. BUCKHOUT, VICE-PRES'T.

FRANK W. BALLARD, Secretary.

NATHAN HARPER, Ass't Sec'y.

~~~~~  
Fire and Inland Insurance at Lowest Rates.



## NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## EXTRACTS FROM LEADING JOURNALS,

## FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC.

— 101 —

This journal supports creditably the critical ability of New York, and often contains papers that would make a sensation if they appeared in some medium of longer traditional reputation.—*New York Daily Times*.

Il [the Editor] a mérité l'estime de nos savans par d'importans travaux comme critique sur a haute education, aussi bien que la littérature.—*Indépendance Belge, Brussels*.

It is at once the most learned, most brilliant and most attractive of all their (the American) periodicals.—*London Spectator*.

Its articles are of the first order for vigor, comprehensiveness and ability. Its criticisms are keen, good tempered, and fearless. Literary charlatanism gets no mercy.—*National Intelligencer*.

La clarté, l'ordre, la précision du style ; ce que les Anglais appellent *Amour* et, parfois ironie, sont les qualités que distinguent le *National Quarterly Review*, au-dessus de tout autre journal littéraire Américain.—*Le Pays, Paris*.

Aussi Habile écrivain que savant et inflexible critique.—*Paris Journal des Débats*.

While perusing its pages, we have been often struck with the sterling qualities of this periodical, which is an honor to our literature and a monument to our national reputation. The view is from the Protestant stand point, and yet it is, in almost every particular, just and true, though entirely different from that usually taken by Protestant writers.—*Baltimore Catholic Mirror*.

We have been much interested in witnessing the steady advance of this periodical. It combines great learning with vigor of style and fearless utterance.—*Boston Journal*.

This Review certainly stands now at the head of American critical literature, and is so esteemed in Europe. It has fearlessly exposed charlatanism and quackery—whether in science literature, insurance companies, phrenology, or medicine.—*Philadelphia Press*.

It certainly exhibits high culture and marked ability.—*London Saturday Review*.

Dr. Sears is one of the very best and ablest Quarterly editors in the world, and no scholar would desire to see a single leaf of his well-won laurels disturbed.—*New Yorker*.

We relish the incisive discussions which are a prominent feature in the *Quarterly*, of the "sensational novels," and the very dirty accompanying phases of publishers' and critics' operations, and its energetic exposure of sundry impudent translations of French novels. The critical department is unusually full and careful, especially upon educational books. . . . Its critical estimates of moral and literary merits and demerits are honest, clear, and almost always trustworthy.—*New York Independent*.

More than a year ago we ranked it with the best of our own Quarterlies, and it certainly has not lagged since in ability or vigor.—*London Daily News*.

It is not often that we have a number of a Quarterly so thoroughly readable and so genuinely true as this. There is not in it an article which fails to captivate the reader, and there are some for which, in these days of cant sensationalism and nonsense, we cannot be too thankful. Those upon "International Courtesies" and the "President's Veto" commend themselves to every thinker as just, and every patriot as needed by the times and people.—*Providence Daily Post*.

It is creditable to our transatlantic friends to sustain a journal which, like the *National Quarterly Review*, possesses the courage to unmask false pretensions, and both the ability and disposition to improve the public taste.—*Edinburgh Scotsman*.

The review of "Our Quack Doctors and their Performances" is a cleverly-written and scathing *expose* of the tricks by which medical imposters contrive to gull weak-minded and nervous people out of their money.—*New York Herald*.

Pour bien apprecier cet écrivain il faut le comparer à ses dévanciers dans la littérature critique Américaine et l'on verra quel pas immense qu'il fit faire.—*La Presse, Paris*.

We have seldom seen in any of the great Quarterlies such a variety of ably written papers *Providence Journal*.

This Review stands unrivalled in America for all that constitutes literary excellence. On no other work can we rely for a sound and impartial criticism on the leading works of the day.—*Canadian Post*.

This work is well conducted, ably written, and more than all, interestingly useful. Every good citizen should desire to sustain it, for its healthful, moral spirit.—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

The most animated and vigorous of all our Quarterlies, and will sustain a comparison with the best European publications of its class. The editor is a man of independent mind, who takes his position boldly, and maintains it with skill and courage, that seems sometimes to border on ashness and hardihood; but this makes his *Review* worth reading.—*Boston Traveller*.

Every one of these articles is brilliantly written. The editor, Dr. Sears, is an Irish Protestant. His *Review* proves intellect as fine as can be found, and candor as unrestricted, by prejudiced limits, as the Catholic Church itself can require. Certainly the Catholics, particularly the Irish Catholics, of this country, should well support a publication which is thus distinguished.—*Philadelphia Catholic Universal*.

## CONTRIBUTORS

TO

## THE NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The following list includes only those whose contributions have attracted particular attention:

| Contributors.                              | Titles of Articles.                                |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| ADLER, G. J., A. M.,* New York.            | William Von Humboldt as a Comparative Philologist. |
| BOYLE, HON. DR. LAWRENCE, New York.        | The Canadas, their Position and Destiny.           |
| BURTON, E. L., M. D., LL. D., New York.    | Quackery and the Quacked.                          |
| BRISTOW, DR. HENRY G., St. Louis, Mo.      | Yellow Fever, &c.                                  |
| CHEEVER, HENRY R., Boston, Mass.           | Modern Italian Literature.                         |
| DANA, ALEX. H., New York.                  | Philosophy of Population; Popular Illusions.       |
| DENNISON, PROF. HENRY, Glasgow, Scotland.  | The Works of Charles Dickens.                      |
| GALBRAITH, REV. H. LEFER, Dublin, Ireland. | Mexican Antiquities.                               |
| CHARLES G. GREENE, JR., Boston, Mass.      | The Turko-Greek Question; The Irish Church.        |
| HENZEL, PROF. CARL B., Philadelphia.       | Wills and Will Making.                             |
| HILL, CLEMENT HUGH, Boston, Mass.          | William Pitt and his Times.                        |

\* The academic degrees are given only of those whom the editor happens to know to possess such honors.

- HOLLAND, REV. HENRY L., New York.....Our National Defences.  
HUDSON, JOSEPH DANA, Portland, Maine.....Vico's Philosophy of History.  
HOWARD, EDWARD D., M. D., New York.....Availability of Politicians vs. Statesmen.  
LIEBER, PROF. JAMES T., Louisville, Ky.....New Theories, &c., in Natural History.  
LLOYD, PROF. MAX G., Boston, Mass.....The Poems of Elizabeth Barrett Browning.  
MACKENZIE, DR. R. SHELTON, Philadelphia.....Lord Palmerston; The Ruling Class in England; The Man with the Iron Mask; Irish Law and Lawyers; Sydney Smith and his Associates; Illustrated Satirical Literature.  
MILLS, REV. HENRY, LL. D., London, England.....The Saracenic Civilization in Spain.  
MCLENAHAN, JOHN, New York.....A Glance at the Turkish Empire; Hungary, Past and Present; Berkeley, his Life and Writings; The Union not a League, &c.  
MEZZROCCHI, E. C., M. D., Boston, Mass.....Count de Cavour.  
MORSE, JOHN T., Boston, Mass.....The Conspiracy of Catiline; Graham of Claverhouse, and the Covenanters; Wallenstein.  
MUNSEN, REV. WILLIAM T., Portland, Maine.....Education, &c., of Christian Ministry.  
NILAN, Rev. Dr., Port Jervis, N. Y.....Present Aspect of Christianity.  
PERHAULT, PROF. EUGENE, Berlin, Prussia.....Danish and Swedish Poetry.  
PRENDERGAST, THOMAS D., LL. D., London, England.....Italy, Past and Present.  
REED, JOS. J., Philadelphia.....The Parsees; Successive Conquests and Races of Ancient Mexico; Celtic Music; King Arthur and the Round Table Knights.  
RYAN, PROF. D. J., St. Mary's College, Ky.....Sir Thomas More and his Times; Sacred Poetry of the Middle Ages.  
SEARS, E. I., LL. D.....Dante; Torquato Tasso; Camoens and his Translators; James Fenimore Cooper; The Nineteenth Century; The Modern French Drama; Persian Poetry; Modern Criticism; Ancient Civilization of the Hindoos; French Romances and American Morals; The Greek Comic Drama—Aristophanes; The Men and Women of Homer; Influence of Music—The Opera; The Poetical Literature of Spain; Vindication of the Celts; Christopher Martin Wieland; Bombastic Literature; Female Education, Good, Bad, and Indifferent; The Chinese Language and Literature; The Comedies of Moliere; The Works and Influence of Goethe; The Laws and Ethics of War; Lucretius on the Nature of Things; The Arts and Sciences among the Ancient Egyptians; The Quackery of Insurance Companies; Arabic Language and Literature; Spuriousness and Charlatanism of Phrenology; The Insane and Their Treatment Past and Present; La Place and his Discoveries The Mexicans and their Revolutions; The Brazilian Empire; Klopstock as a Lyric and Epic Poet; Our Quack Doctors and their Performances; Kepler and his Discoveries; Chemistry—Its History, Progress, and Utility; Do the Lower Animals Reason? Spinoza and his Philosophy; Commencements of Colleges, &c.; Pythagoras and his Philosophy; Leibnitz as a Philosopher and Discoverer; Our Presidents and Governors Compared to Kings and Petty Princes; Italian Poetry—Ariosto; Machiavelli and his Maxims of Government; The Celtic Druids; Galileo and his Discoveries; Socrates and his Philosophy; Authenticity of Ossian's Poems; Heine and his Works; Napoleon III's Julius Caesar; Newton and his Discoveries; Alfieri; Robert Boyle and his Influence; The Ancient Phoenicians; Virgil and his New Translator; The Jews and their Persecutions; Dante and his New Translator; Greek Comedy—Menander; Martin Luther and the Old Church; Epicurus and his Philosophy; The Venetian Republic and its Council of Ten; Nicholas Copernicus; Infernal Divinities Ancient and Modern; Orangeism in Ireland; Diogenes the Cynic; Vindication of Euripides, &c., &c.  
STUART, PROF. JAMES C., Aberdeen, Scotland, The Sciences among Ancients and Moderns.  
VOSBURG, J. H., New York.....The Sorrows of Burns; Beranger and his Songs; Rousseau and his Influence.  
WOODRUFF, Prof. J. B., Nashville, Tenn.....The Civilizing Forces.  
WENTWORTH, REV. E. L., Toronto, Canada.....The Works of Miss Evans.

THE

## NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

A LITERARY AND CRITICAL JOURNAL OF THE FIRST CLASS, EACH NUMBER CONTAINING OVER  
200 PAGES. PUBLISHED IN MARCH, JUNE, SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER.

Established 1860.

EDWARD I. SEARS, LL.D., Editor, Proprietor and Founder.

The liberal patronage extended to us, even during the gloomiest period of the late rebellion, and which has been steadily increasing since the restoration of peace, affords us the most gratifying proof that, in subjecting to fearless and searching criticism whatever has a tendency to vitiate the public taste, and exposing charlatanism of all kinds, we enjoy the approbation of the educated and enlightened in all parts of the country.

Nor have we to rely on mere inference. Were we to avail ourselves of private letters emphatically commending our course, we could fill an octavo volume with the briefest extracts from those of distinguished men and women, including authors, artists, lawyers, distinguished church dignitaries of different denominations, chancellors and professors of colleges, principals of academies, seminaries and schools. We assure all who have thus encouraged us that we will exert ourselves more and more in the future to merit their confidence and esteem.

While it affords none more pleasure to do justice to the merits of good books, we shall continue to criticise those of the opposite character. A notice in a paper, which must necessarily be brief, may be more appreciative than the character of the work noticed deserves, and yet not imply any dishonesty or bad faith on the part of the editor; but if a Quarterly does not make some attempt to separate the wheat from the chaff, but praises every book it notices, it is simply a puffing machine and not a Review. We do not make this remark with the view of depreciating any other journal, or finding fault with the manner in which it is conducted, but simply to show that, if our criticisms sometimes seem harsh, it is not because we are actuated by personal feeling against any one. In proof of this our readers will bear us testimony that under no circumstances have we ever made any attack on private character; that if we have denounced men of all grades, parties and sects, we have, in every instance, confined ourselves to their public acts; nor shall we do anything different in the future.

All subjects of public interest will continue to be fully and fearlessly discussed in the Review, but without impugning anybody's religious creed. As long as we have control of its pages, we shall oppose bigotry and intolerance, whether Protestant or Catholic. Talent and culture will always be welcome to its pages, and, as much as possible, encouraged.

Education in every form, including Art and Science, will receive prominent and friendly attention; and whatever seems calculated to retard or vitiate it, whether under the name of a text-book, a painting, a seminary, a gallery, or a college, will be subject to fearless, but fair and temperate, criticism.

While aiming at being cosmopolitan—doing justice as far as possible to what every nationality has contributed to civilization and human progress—the NATIONAL REVIEW is decidedly American in feeling and sympathies, and unalterably attached to our free institutions. But far from being the organ of any party or sect—while disclaiming to be either partisan or sectarian—we shall continue to treat the individuals of all parties or sects, according as their public conduct may seem to us to merit. In short, no pains or expense will be spared to render the work worthy of the character assigned to it by the leading organs of public opinion at home and abroad—namely, “*The best of American Reviews.*”

(See pp. 37-39.)





## EXTRACTS

FROM

### NOTICES AND REVIEWS OF OUR TWO LAST NUMBERS,

BY LEADING JOURNALS.

---

\* \* \* "Vassar College and its Degrees is a merciless unmasking of an educational sham, deserving the gratitude of all friends of true education." \* \* —*Christian Standard, Cincinnati, O.*

---

\* \* \* "No one can take up the two American quarterlies without feeling that while the one is the organ of a clique, and bound down and restrained by the narrowest Puritan sentiment, the other is broad, generous, and catholic in tone, and world wide in its sympathy. The *North American* and its little sister, the *Atlantic Monthly*, think of the world from what Lord Bacon would have called the Cave, and treat the world as if Boston were really the hub of the universe. The *National Quarterly* takes a nobler standpoint, and, from its grander elevation, makes juster observations, and arrives at more correct conclusions." \* \* —*New York Herald.*

---

\* \* \* "We have to draw particular attention to some fearless and authentic revelations in a paper entitled 'The Ethics and Aesthetics of our Summer Resorts.' The Reviewer here places before the public a series of facts, which the personal experience of a large class throughout the country will endorse. Here is a sketch of 'Living at a Summer Resort;' [Extracts of several pages follow.] \* \* —*Philadelphia Press.*

---

\* \* \* "Those who have passed the summer in the covert out-of-town trysting places of fashion will, of course, read with avidity, 'The Ethics and Aesthetics of our Summer Resorts.'" \* \* —*Philadelphia Inquirer.*

---

\* \* \* "The entire number, hackneyed as many of the subjects are, is so carefully worked up and so thoroughly studied that all is fresh and readable." \* \* —*Newark Advertiser.*

---

\* \* \* "In the new number of the *National Quarterly Review* there is an article in which literary brigandage of a humbler kind is exposed. The writer is dwelling upon the scandalous treatment to which guests are subjected in many hotels ('Summer Resorts') and the high prices they are compelled to pay for abominable food and accommodation. How is it that such hotels get custom at all?" \* \* —*New York Times.*

---

\* \* \* "The Ethics and Aesthetics of our Summer Resorts" tells some startling truths about the hotels and hotel keepers of our watering places. It is a vigorous exposition of the gross outrages and swindles which are perpetrated upon hapless pleasure seekers. The writer very justly charges certain newspapers with being responsible for false accounts of the comforts to be enjoyed at these places, and with seldom giving the facts as they occur." \* \* —*N. Y. Herald.*

Two Dollars (\$2.00) will be paid by the Editor for each copy of the first or second number of the National Quarterly Review.

### To Contributors.

All articles should be received at least a month before the day of publication. Contributions from all parts are equally welcome ; they will be accepted or rejected solely according to their merits or demerits, their suitableness or unsuitableness.

## CONTENTS OF NO. XXXIX.

DECEMBER, 1869.

- I. HINDOO MYTHOLOGY AND ITS INFLUENCE.
- II. HUGO AND SAINT-BEUVE.
- III. THE GREEK CHURCH.
- IV. WOMAN'S RIGHTS VIEWED PHYSIOLOGICALLY AND HISTORICALLY.
- V. ROBIN HOOD AND HIS TIMES.
- VI. OUR MILLIONAIRES AND THEIR INFLUENCE.
- VII. MR. GLADSTONE ON THE HEROIC AGES.
- VIII. ECLIPSES AND THEIR PHENOMENA.
- IX. NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

## AGENTS

FOR THE

## NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The Review may be had of the following Agents:

NEW YORK.—New York, Sinclair Tousey, General Agent, 121 Nassau Street. Rochester, D. M. Dewey. Buffalo, J. S. Hawks. Troy, S. T. Hoyt.  
CONNECTICUT.—New Haven, J. H. Pease. Hartford, F. A. Brown.  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Washington, Taylor & Maury.  
ILLINOIS.—Chicago, John E. Walsh.  
KENTUCKY.—Louisville, J. W. Clark and F. A. Crimp.  
MAINE.—Portland, George R. Dennis & Brother. Augusta, Edward Fenno.  
PENNSYLVANIA.—Philadelphia, James K. Simon, 33 South Sixth Street, General Agent for Pennsylvania. Pittsburg, Kay & Co.  
BRITISH AMERICA.—Kingston, C. W., T. W. Robinson. Montreal, B. Dawson & Son. Quebec, P. Sinclair. St. John's, N. B., J. & A. McMillan. Halifax, E. G. Fuller.  
MASSACHUSETTS.—Boston, A. Williams & Co., General Agents for New England ; W. V. Spencer, 134 Washington Street ; John J. Dyer & Co., 35 School Street. Springfield, Chapin, Birdsever & Co. Lowell, B. C. Sargent.

**SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$5 A YEAR IN ADVANCE**